

VOL. XXIII.

APRIL, 1946.

No. 2

# THE AUSTRALASIAN Catholic Record

FOR CLERGY  
AND RELIGIOUS.



Editor :

REV. T. VEECH, St. Patrick's College, Manly.

Manager :

REV. R. B. COUGHLAN, St. Patrick's College, Manly.

*The Official Organ for communications issued by the  
Apostolic Delegate to Australasia.*

# Announcements

CORRESPONDENCE: All correspondence should be addressed to Editor, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

Queries relating to S. Scripture, Moral Theology, Canon Law, Liturgy, or any subject of professional interest, are cordially invited.

SUBSCRIPTIONS: *Yearly, in advance, 12/-.*

Remittances should be sent to the Manager or the Diocesan Collector, either by postal order or cheque.

*The clergy of each diocese are invited to appoint one of their number to collect and forward their annual subscriptions.*

The following priests are acting as collectors and representatives for the *Australasian Catholic Record* in their respective dioceses:—

Archdiocese of Wellington—Rev. W. J. Walsh, Opunake, N.Z.

Archdiocese of Adelaide—Rev. D. O'Connell, Murray Bridge, S.A.

Archdiocese of Brisbane—

Archdiocese of Hobart—Rev. J. Wallis, Launceston, Tas.

Diocese of Armidale—Rev. J. Healy, Armidale, N.S.W.

Diocese of Auckland—Rev. L. Buxton, D.C.L., M.A., Parnell, N.Z.

Diocese of Ballarat—V. Rev. J. P. Walsh, R.I., V.F. St. Arnaud, Vic.

Diocese of Bathurst—V. Rev. M. J. Dunne, B.A., Adm. Bathurst, N.S.W.

Diocese of Darwin—Rev. W. Henschke, M.S.C., Darwin, N.T.

Diocese of Dunedin—Rev. A. Loughnan, Dunedin, N.Z.

Diocese of Geraldton—Rev. Bryan Gallagher, Ph.D., Geraldton, W.A.

Diocese of Goulburn—V. Rev. J. Blakeney, Adm. Goulburn, N.S.W.

Diocese of Lismore—V. Rev. T. Morris, P.P., Smithtown, N.S.W.

Diocese of Maitland—V. Rev. P. McCormack, P.P., Singleton, N.S.W.

Diocese of Port Augusta—Very Rev. W. P. Kain, Pekina, S.A.

Diocese of Rockhampton—Rev. D. G. Tiernan, Rockhampton, N.Q.

Diocese of Sale—V. Rev. J. Fitzpatrick, Cowwarr, Vic.

Diocese of Sandhurst—Rev. J. Hussey, Shepparton, Vic.

Diocese of Toowoomba—Rev. M. Mahon, Allora, Q.

Diocese of Townsville—Very Rev. K. J. H. Kelly, D.D., Ayr, Q.

Diocese of Wagga—Rev. J. H. Larkins, Wagga, N.S.W.

Diocese of Wilcannia-Forbes—Very Rev. Dean J. Sexton, V.F., Nyngan, N.S.W.

# The Australasian Catholic Record

A Quarterly Publication under Ecclesiastical Sanction

*"Pro Ecclesia Dei." St. Augustine.*

## Contents:

OBLIGATION OF CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY STUDENTS TO CATHOLIC ACTION, Most Rev. J. D. Simonds, D.D.	65
APOSTLES OF TO-MORROW, V. Rev. J. T. McMahon, M.A., Ph.D. The Discipleship of Christ demands Spiritual Fitness.	81
CATHOLIC PRINCIPLES OF SEX INSTRUCTION, Rev. L. Rumble, M.S.C., S.T.D.	91
VENOM AND VINEGAR. THE "SITIO" PSALM, REV. W. Leonard, D.D., D.S.S.	103
MORAL THEOLOGY . . . . . V. Rev. James Madden, D.D. Problems on betting and racing—Viaticum administered by lay persons—Baptism of children of lax Catholics—Obligation of nurses to confer private Baptism.	119
LITURGY . . . . . Rev. James Carroll, D.C.L., P.P. Beatification and Canonization.	129
NOTES . . . . . His Eminence Cardinal Gilroy—Monsignor Nevin—Monsignor O'Donnell—The People's Eucharistic League—Rings and Gems— Ecclesiastical History during the war.	136
BOOK REVIEWS . . . . . Too small a world (Maynard). We have been friends together (Maritain).	153



**Nihil Obstat :**

RICHARDUS COLLENDER

CENSOR DEPUTATUS.

**Imprimatur :**

✠ N.T. CARD. GILROY,

ARCHIEP. SYDNEYENSIS.

Die 1a Aprilis, 1946.

# The Obligation of Catholic University Students to Catholic Action (1)

## UNIVERSITY EDUCATION.

During the century since Newman penned his classic indictment of modern university education, the evils he diagnosed have increased in virulence, and the remedies he prescribed have been treated largely with contempt. He inveighed against the decay of liberal culture, and the increasing tendency to divert university education into the narrow channels demanded by technical development. The disease he diagnosed has reached its crisis in this era of excessive specialisation, which is now slowly enslaving education in a bondage to the laboratory and to the professional desk. Our universities are turning out an ever-increasing number of young men and women splendidly efficient in their restricted fields, but dangerously deficient in the general hierarchy of knowledge, which it was the original function of the universities to guard. In the second portion of his thesis he maintained that a university fails in its function if the full humane education at which it aims does not combine in due order the study of religious truth as well as the pursuit of liberal knowledge. "Religious truth", he wrote, is not only a portion, but a condition of general knowledge. . . . You will soon break up into fragments the whole circle of secular knowledge, if you begin the mutilation with the Divine". His warning and prophetic words have been fulfilled. The mutilation of the circle of secular knowledge is now practically complete. The unifying principles of Theology and Metaphysics, which impose a discipline on minds as well as wills, are outcast from most modern halls of higher learning, and each specialist is free to set up his own interpretation of human life from the special facts and theories of his own particular field of investigation. Maritain was right, I think, when he said that the chief disorder affecting the world to-day is not so much a moral malady as a radical disease of the mind, and the two destructive wars that have recently scourged the race were but symptoms of that disease. We are very busy to-day fixing the due measure of blame upon the official war criminals, and securing their adequate punishment. But a large share of responsibility for the awful tragedies of this century should be laid at the door of those leaders of thought, who have slowly but surely

---

(1) Address delivered by Most Rev. Justin D. Simonds, Co-adjutor Archbishop of Melbourne, to the University Catholic Federation of Australia.

conditioned men's minds to the purely secular concept of human life. As the movements of thought were gradually directed away from the anchorage of the Christian Faith, now ostracised from the principal chairs of culture, scientific materialism has been enabled to take a firm grip on human minds. This has made it easy for the shackles of the State to be tightened on the citizen step by step, until many men conscientiously believe that their highest destiny is to submerge their individuality in the Super-State, or in some vague abstraction like the "social collectivity" of the Communist. In an age thus socially conditioned it is little wonder that modern planners of the new era seem to think that, if only they can arrange for national security and the stabilisation of world markets, they can proceed to create a world factory for the mass production of happy and contented citizens.

#### A STERN ENCOUNTER.

With an intuitive insight into the crises which would confront our age, the English Cardinal predicted that the conflict which the Church would face in the twentieth century would not be with Protestantism, whether Anglican or Evangelical, but with the organised forces of aggressive secularism. He said it would be a "stern encounter" between two real and living principles, one in the Church and the other outside of it, contending not for names and words or half views, but for fundamental notions, and raising their standards for and against destructive moral theories. That issue has been joined to-day. As a spearhead in the coming conflict Newman wished to see a strong, intelligent and dogmatic mentality formed in the Catholic layman. He pleaded for an educated Catholic laity, conscious of the superiority which their religion gives them over the shallowness of the age, and fired with a zeal to employ it in the cause of Christ. His discerning mind clearly perceived that the personal influence, which enlightened Catholic individuals can exert on their fellow men in the cause of truth, was not being exercised in his day mainly because it was not organised. He said that men are readily influenced by other men, and therefore the principle of personal influence must play an important part in the strategy of the present struggle. He pleaded for the development of a virile Catholic mind, and the organisation of personal influence upon their fellow intellectuals by those who know their religion thoroughly, and appreciate its relation to the tendencies of the age. It might be claimed that these ideas of Cardinal Newman were an anticipation of the development of Catholic Action by Pope Pius XI, for



these two principles of personal influence and organised activity are fundamental to Catholic Action. But, of course, it is well known, and it was frequently insisted on by Pope Pius XI., that he was not introducing a novelty into the Catholic Church when he issued his mandate for the world-wide organisation of the laity in the fight for the cause of Christ. "It is quite clear", he wrote, "that Our Predecessors approved of and utilised this method of safeguarding the Catholic cause; for the harder the times were for the Church and the people, the more earnestly were the faithful encouraged, as if by a rallying cry, to fight the battle of the Lord under the leadership of their Bishops, and to do all in their power for the eternal salvation of their neighbour".

#### PIUS XI AND CATHOLIC ACTION.

The monumental work which Pope Pius XI. did for Catholic Action was to crystallize the teachings and exhortations of his Predecessors on the Lay Apostolate, and give to the world a definition of Catholic Action that is now a classic. He also clarified the theological basis of this Apostolate, and calmed the fears of those good people, clerical and lay, who suspected the apostolic aspirations of unordained youths as a dangerous novelty in the Church of God. The Pope, as is well known, defined Catholic Action as "the participation by the Catholic laity in the Apostolate of the Hierarchy of the Church", and he boldly asserted on several occasions that the Holy Spirit of God had inspired him in framing this definition. But the illustrious Pontiff was not a mere theorist in the field of Catholic Action. He was also a clear-sighted architect of its practical organisation. He declared it to be the "apple of his eye", and in his Encyclicals, Allocutions and letters to the Hierarchy he rarely failed to include some practical advice on the details of its function. The Holy Father's exhortations and commands did not fall on unheeding ears in Australia. We have already set up a framework of Catholic Action, based on the plans for a national set-up, which he outlined in a letter to the Hierarchy of Brazil (27 Oct., 1935). In fidelity to the mind of the Holy Father, the parish, which is the canonical unit of Catholic life, was accepted as the first field in which organised groups were called into being. Then, as the spirit of the Apostolate was caught by a growing number of enthusiasts, the Bishops decided that the time was ripe for specialisation. Not that specialisation belongs to the very essence of Catholic Action. It is merely a matter of technique. But the keen mind of the Sovereign Pontiff realised that it is *the* method of organisation which best meets

the condition of our times, and Catholic Action must adapt itself to the circumstances of the age. Already we have several flourishing national movements of specialised Catholic Action, organised according to sex, age, and environment, in conformity with the principle laid down by the Holy Father, that the apostles of the workers must be workers, the apostles of the farmers must be farmers, and the apostles of the students will be students. I regret to say that the rich field of university life is still largely outside the field of official specialised Catholic Action in Australia, and for that reason, I am grateful for the opportunity of speaking to the University Catholic Federation of Australia on this important subject.

#### THE CHARTER OF CATHOLIC ACTION.

In addressing university men and women I consider it more appropriate, and more in harmony with the mind of Cardinal Newman, to expound to you the theological basis of the Lay Apostolate, rather than reiterate the frequent exhortations and commands of Popes and Bishops on the subject. I feel confident that any enlightened Catholic who thoroughly appreciates the splendour of dogmatic wealth contained in the doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ, and who realises the true import of the sacramental character of Confirmation, will be fired with a desire to share his spiritual riches with every man of good will, who is groping for a rational interpretation of human and social life. It was the Providential task of Pope Pius the Eleventh to define and organise Catholic Action within the Church. But his August Successor, our present Holy Father, has given us, in his Encyclical on the Mystical Body of Christ, what may be justly called the "Charter of Catholic Action". Timid souls, it is true, dwell only on that small section of the document in which the Holy Father warns the faithful against some erroneous tendencies associated with the mystery. But, in reality, the Encyclical is a document so rich in constructive theology and positive guidance, that it must rank amongst the greatest Encyclicals that have issued from the Holy See. It is also splendidly symbolic of the soul of the holy Pontiff who rules the Church to-day, for his line of approach to non-Catholic minds, as ours should be, is not by way of acrimonious controversy, nor yet by compromise, but by exposing to them the fullness of our spiritual wealth. I earnestly commend this noble document to your study and reflection, for it cannot fail to inspire you with a high sense of your God-given dignity as a member of the Body of Christ, and a deep consciousness of your personal responsibility to our non-Catholic brethren.



## ORGANISATION OR ORGANISM.

It was one of the tragic effects of the 16th Century revolt that the fierce denial of the Papal prerogatives and of the powers of the ordained priesthood threw the theologians of the post-Reformation period on the defensive to justify each of these doctrines individually. In their anti-Protestant apologetic they were forced to place the emphasis mostly upon the external organisation of the Church, with the result that the organic and dynamic concept of the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ became largely obscured in the minds of the faithful. Theological treatises on the Church during the last three centuries, written chiefly in reply to Protestant polemics, treated the Church rather as an organisation than an organism, laying too little emphasis on the inner reality of the Church's life that quickens its external structure, and makes its children members of Christ. It is known that the Fathers of the Vatican Council, whose work was temporarily interrupted by the political disturbances of 1870, intended to redraft a constitution of the Church, stated in terms of the traditional doctrine of the Body of Christ, but their work was never completed. It was left to our present Holy Father to restate this glorious teaching in a well-balanced and constructive Encyclical Letter. Pius XII has given to the faithful of to-day a new and fresh appreciation of the ancient teaching on the divinely founded community to which they belong, and which should also become a pattern for human society at large.

## THE HEADSHIP OF JESUS CHRIST.

The Pope reminds us that the defection of Adam, the first Head of the human family, subjected the whole human race to the dominion of sin. But in God's marvellous plan of wisdom and mercy He decided to reinstate the redeemed race under a new Head, His own Divine Son. The unique Son of God, Who from all eternity dwells in the Bosom of the Father, united a human nature to Himself so intimately that this nature, perfect in itself, belongs entirely to the Divine Person to Whom it is united. Jesus Christ is God and Man in the unity of one Person. The Divine Life, therefore, which proceeds from the Father to the Son eternally, proceeds now in time to the humanity of Christ, and through Him, as Head of the race, it circulates, and will circulate, in all who are united with Him in charity. Communication of this Life of God is made to men within the Church, until such time as the Divine work of salvation shall have been fully achieved. On that day, the vast multitude of redeemed humanity, with purified souls

and resurrected bodies, will be presented to God in triumph by Christ as His Mystical Body, that is to say "the Whole Christ, Head and Members". St. Paul seems never to weary of reminding his readers that by baptism they have been incorporated into Christ as living members of His Body, and that it is their duty to become more and more like to their Divine Head and Model. From Christ's fullness He nourishes and sustains each of the members, according to the place they occupy in the Body, very much as the vine nourishes and makes fruitful the branches that are joined to it, to use Our Lord's own analogy. It would be a mistake to consider this Body of Christ as a mere metaphorical concept, or even as a "spiritual" body. It is real and visible, both here and in the hereafter. It is, however, called the "Mystical" Body of Christ to distinguish it from the physical body in which Our Lord suffered death, and triumphed in resurrection. Nor is the Mystical Body of Christ a mere moral union of members, such as exists between the members of your Federation. Nor is it an arbitrary accumulation of isolated members. It is a real and organic structure, whose Head is Christ, and whose members live by the life which flows from the Head, and who function hierarchically as members of the organism, according to their status within the Body.

#### PRINCIPLE OF LIFE.

Now, every living body must have a principle of life, by which it lives and moves and has its being. What then is that principle of life which vivifies the Body of Christ, and is shared by both Head and members? It is none other than the very Divine Life of The Son of God, which is communicated to us in sanctifying grace. Without effacing the infinite difference between the Creator and the creature, and without suppressing our individuality and personality, Christ the Head communicates to every baptised person a share of that Life which is His from all eternity. By sanctifying grace we are made, in St. Peter's words, "partakers of the Divine Nature". Remember that the phrase is not a metaphor, but literal truth. Bossuet's grim epigram that "those who give us birth, kill us" is therefore true, except they bring us to the font of regeneration or second birth, to a life, which is a participation in the very life of God. Jesus Christ, in Whom resides the plenitude of grace, communicates to each baptised person His Divine Spirit, Whose indwelling in our souls is accompanied by an infusion of supernatural powers, which theologians do not hesitate to say *deify* our faculties. Faith, hope and charity, the Gifts of the Holy



Spirit, and the moral virtues infused at baptism engraft our faculties on to the very life of God Himself, so that as long as we are in the state of grace, our slightest actions become super-natural and ring in eternity. In the infant, of course, these virtues remain poised for action until his faculties are capable of responsible action in later life. But in adult age, though we may not be able to distinguish the difference between natural and supernatural actions in men, the baptised member of Christ acts no longer as a natural man, but in the words of St. Paul, he can say in truth, "I live, now not I, but Christ liveth in me". This is the joyful theme that rings through all the letters of St. Paul—the Divine marvel of our incorporation into Christ our Head, and our adoption as sons of God, in Christ, and through Christ our Brother. The phrase "in Christ", or its equivalent, is used no fewer than 150 times in the epistles of St. Paul, and 35 times in the short Epistle to the Ephesians, in which he traces for us so magnificently the Divine plan of our incorporation into the Son of God.

#### THE BODY'S EXTERNAL STRUCTURE.

With a perfect understanding of our human nature, the Risen Christ recognised our need of a visible exterior structure, by which the supernatural relation between the Head and the members would be perpetuated. While still on earth, He instructed us by precept, counsel, and warning in words that will never pass away, and His Divine Spirit, Who is the Soul of the Mystical Body, guards and guides its life and doctrine. But before Our Lord withdrew His physical presence from us, He entrusted to the chief of the Apostles the visible government of the community He had founded. Throughout the ages, therefore, the exterior guidance of His members is exercised principally through the successor of St. Peter, who is not a second Head of the Body, but the visible and vicarious representative of the One Invisible Head, Jesus Christ. The relation of the Supreme Pontiff with the One Head of the Mystical Body is a divinely constituted one, and on that relationship, as Vicar of Christ, the plenitude of the Pope's authority is based. Communion with the Vicar of Christ is thus a necessary condition of full membership in the Body of Christ. This authority is shared by the Bishop within the limits of his diocese, but in a manner subordinated to the Vicar of Christ. Moreover, by virtue of the solidarity of the entire hierarchy, a share in the care and government of the Universal Church belongs to each Bishop, in union with the Head, Jesus Christ, and in dependence on the Head, and the

Vicar, who represents Him. Within each diocese, therefore, which is an organic unit of the Mystical Body, the Bishop is the centre of unity, and to be united with one's Bishop is a sign that one is a living member of the Body of Christ.

#### SOURCES OF GROWTH.

St. Augustine wisely remarked that, even with a centre of unity, men cannot be gathered together for any length of time in the name of religion without some visible sacrament to unite them. We are creatures of body and spirit. We are incapable of obtaining any knowledge of the intangible spiritual realities, except through the world of sensible things that are perceived by our senses. Human nature in its present condition cannot therefore bear the rich food of the purely spiritual. So, Our Blessed Lord graciously condescended to this infirmity of our nature by instituting seven sacraments as the normal means by which He continues to incorporate us into His Divine Life. To make us one with Him He did not deem it necessary to tear up our material nature by the roots, but He made use of our common material needs, such as, water, oil, bread and wine, to be the vehicles on which we should be carried into the very Life of God. He moreover imparted to these sacraments His own sanctifying power, so that their efficacy does not in fact depend on the holiness or the worthiness of their minister. When they are rightly administered to those who place no obstacle to their grace, they automatically convey the Life-giving Spirit of the Head to the members of His Body. As further proof of His Divine Wisdom and condescension, we have been given a sacrament of grace to meet the needs of every phase of human life. By baptism the child is born into the Life of Christ, or "Christened" in the literal sense of the word, for he is made "another Christ". Confirmation is the sacrament of spiritual manhood, giving to the recipient a title to those graces that he needs as a militant adult. The Blessed Eucharist, the Sacrament of sacraments, is given as our daily spiritual food, by which we may grow in Christ, and become more and more assimilated to Him. Penance is the merciful means by which the Life of Christ may be restored to the soul that has had the misfortune to lose it. Holy Orders are designed to provide the permanent supply of ministers of Christ and dispensers of the mysteries of God. The sacrament of matrimony is the Divinely ordained means of multiplying the number of those who will become the children of God, "unto the measure of the age of the fullness of Christ". Finally, the Last Anointing, which St. Thomas always calls the "unctio ad gloriam"—



the anointing for glory—prepares, and indeed fits the member of Christ for his entry into the Beatific Vision of God.

### THE SACRAMENTAL CHARACTER.

Although the sanctifying grace which each sacrament confers is radically the same, yet the seven sacraments fall into two definite and distinct categories, those that can be repeatedly received, and those which can be received only once. The Blessed Eucharist, Penance, Matrimony, and the Last Anointing may be received as often as the need for their reception arises. Hence they are aptly called the "sacraments of organic life and growth" of the Mystical Body, by which the members are enabled to grow in likeness and conformity to their Divine Head. But the other three sacraments, Baptism, Confirmation and Holy Orders can be received only once in our lifetime, because they have an additional and important function, besides that of giving life and spiritual growth to those who receive them. They are designed to fix the place or status of the recipient within the Body of Christ, and stabilise the relation which the members of the Body bear to the Head, by fitting them to perform certain specific functions within that Body. They are therefore appropriately called the "sacraments of organic structure", for according as a member has received one, two, or three of these sacraments his status and functions within the Body of Christ are determined. This particular effect, over and above that of conferring grace, is due to the fact that each of these three sacraments imprints on the soul of the recipient an indelible mark, or seal, or character. The word "Character" has many meanings in modern usage, but in its original Greek signification it meant an exact or express image, such as is left upon a piece of sealing-wax by the impress of a seal. In sacramental theology this ancient meaning of the word is retained, and by the "Character" of a Sacrament we mean the indelible seal imprinted on the soul, by which our membership and office within the Mystical Body are eternally denoted. It is imprinted, not on the will, which is unstable, but on the more stable faculty of the understanding, and is as immortal as the soul itself. St. Thomas Aquinas, with his usual penetration into Divine things, teaches us that the character that is impressed upon our souls by these three sacraments, is none other than the Character of Christ. As the Son of God is described in the Epistle to the Hebrews as the "Character (or express image) of the Father's Substance" so the sacramental character is the impress of the Son's Character upon our souls, sealing them with a likeness to Him,

and empowering us to perform spiritual functions that are proper to Himself. St. Thomas further enquires what precise likeness or character of Christ is imprinted on our souls by these sacraments, and answers that it is the Character of Christ the Priest, by which we are given the inestimable privilege of sharing in His Priestly Office. The seal of these three sacraments is therefore a ministerial commission, or badge of rank or office in the church, which confers on the recipient a participation in the Priestly Office of Jesus Christ, and empowers him to perform specific acts of Divine worship. Each of the three sacraments of Baptism, Confirmation and Holy Orders incorporates the recipient into the Priesthood of Christ, but to a different degree, and with differing responsibilities.

#### BAPTISM AN ACTIVE PARTICIPATION IN CHRIST.

In reflecting on this important doctrine it is well to remember that a soul may be incorporated into Christ in two ways. Firstly, by becoming a "partaker of the Divine Nature" and of the Life of Christ. This is the function of sanctifying grace received in our rebirth by the sacrament of Baptism, through which we truly become "other Christs" and share His Divine Life and the indwelling of His Holy Spirit. Our regeneration at the font makes us living temples of the Holy Spirit of God, so truly that St. Thomas reminds us that the indwelling of God in our souls by grace, and the divinisation of our faculties by the Divine Presence do not essentially differ from the Beatific Possession of God in Heaven, but only as a matter of degree.

It is, however, a different thing to participate in the *office* and *powers* of Christ the Priest. The angels share in the Divine Life by grace, but they have no participation in the priestly functions of the Son of God. Now, one of the chief functions of the Great High Priest, as head of the human race, is to offer in the name of all mankind, a perfect and acceptable sacrifice to God the Father. This He did once and for all by His atoning Sacrifice of the Cross. But as our New Head, it is also His function to lead all His members to share in that duty and office of worship, and He has deigned to continue and perpetuate His Holy Sacrifice on our altars in a mysterious manner in which all men are able to share. Every member of Christ is in some degree configured or assimilated to Christ as the Supreme Worshipper of the Father, and is deputed to some measure of active participation in that worship. The seal or badge of their commission is the character of the sacraments they have received.



Theologians generally sum up the functions of these three characters by saying that the effect of the sacrament of Baptism is a *passive* one, in so far as it opens to man the treasury of the Church, and gives him the right to receive the sacred things of God; Confirmation invests him with the *active* duty of a Christian soldier, charged with the defence of the treasures bequeathed by Christ; Holy Orders give the recipient the responsibility of administering these sacred things to others. But I think that this generalisation, by which the character of Baptism is regarded as a purely passive power, is not sufficiently accurate. Pope Pius XI reminded us in his Encyclical on "The Reparation due to the Sacred Heart" that all baptised Christians must offer gifts and sacrifice for sin, since they have become partakers of Christ's Holy and Eternal Priesthood by baptism. The Pope is but echoing what St. Irenaeus said in the second century:—"All the just have a priestly ordination", and what St. John Chrysostom said in the fourth century:—"You are made a priest at your baptism". To co-offer the Holy Mass with the celebrant is surely a priestly act, and this privilege does not require the reception of the sacrament of Confirmation, but springs from the character that was received in the sacrament of Baptism. Moreover, every baptised person has the privilege and the right to administer the sacrament of matrimony to his or her partner, and actually confers sacramental grace on the partner's soul. For, you are surely well aware that it is not the attendant priest who administers the sacrament of matrimony to the contracting parties. They mutually confer the sacrament on each other by their common acceptance of the holy contract. The official witness of the Church blesses the union, but does not administer the sacrament. The sacramental grace which the partners receive comes to them directly from Christ, the Head, in virtue of their baptismal character. Catholics should never forget that by far the most precious wedding gift, which the bridegroom and the bride make to each other on their wedding morning, is the gift of God's grace which they minister to one another. Thus marriage is the only one of the seven sacraments which is not directly dependent on the priesthood for the normal reception of grace. Indeed, the Canon Law of the Church has made provision for those rare circumstances, in which a couple may be living in a locality so isolated and secluded, that it is impossible for them to obtain the ministry of a priest. In such exceptional cases, the contracting parties may enter into a valid marriage without the assistance of an officiating priest. They thus confer sacramental grace upon each other, which flows directly from their mutual

Head, in virtue of the sacramental character of their Baptism. Christ has therefore made the bride and the bridegroom of a Christian marriage His direct and living instruments in the noble mission of fostering the growth of the Mystical Body. From these observations it should be clear that by the sacrament of Baptism a Character is received, which is far from being a purely passive share in Christ's Priesthood, but on the contrary, it admits the faithful into a very active participation in the Priestly Powers of Christ the Head.

### SPIRITUAL MANHOOD.

Just as in the natural order the infant must grow to maturity and manhood before he attains to the full development of his personality, so in the supernatural order the child of God must be brought to spiritual manhood, in order to do the things of a man. Christ the Head has not failed His youthful members in this critical period of their spiritual growth, but has left them a sacrament which consecrates their entry into the adult stage of life, as the dawning consciousness of personal responsibility stirs within them. This is the sacrament of Confirmation, which gives the recipient a new status in the Body of Christ, that of full maturity, and the Divine Spirit of God awakens in him a holy instinct of service in the cause of his Master. Unfortunately this holy Sacrament of Confirmation is too often a mere memory of a vague spiritual experience of our school days. Actually, it was our second incorporation into the Priesthood of Jesus Christ, empowering us to make public profession of our Faith, and imposing upon us the right and the duty of teaching, admonishing and strengthening others in the things that pertain to their duty to God. The confirmed person, though not formally dispensing grace as the ordained priest does, disposes others for the reception of grace by his active encouragement and by his example. This is a priestly act, for the entire work of sanctifying souls is accomplished only through the Priesthood of Jesus Christ. The co-operation of the confirmed layman is thus an important and active participation in the development of social Catholicism, and in building up the Mystical Body of Christ. On the soul of the confirmed youth is imprinted the indelible character of the sacrament, identifying him eternally as one of the band of undaunted warriors enlisted in the battalions of the Divine Leader. This character gives the youthful recipient a new and active status in the Mystical Body of Christ. Hence St. Thomas does not hesitate to call Confirmation a "quasi ordinatio"—a kind of ordination—by which the layman is endowed



with an active share in the Priestly Office of the Divine Head. For this reason, Confirmation is often called the Sacrament of Catholic Action, and the layman's ordination to his Lay Apostolate. The anniversary of its reception should be one of the dates which every person ought to celebrate with joy and gratitude.

### PARTICIPATION.

We may now be able to understand a little more clearly what is the precise meaning of the Pope's definition of Catholic Action as "the participation of the laity in the Apostolate of the Catholic Hierarchy". The laity of to-day enjoy this formal share in the Church's Apostolate of saving souls, not merely because they have been specifically invited to undertake it by the Vicar of Christ. Rather, they have received the invitation because of what is already in them by the Divine grace and the Character of the sacraments of Baptism and Confirmation. This was expressly said by Pope Pius XI:—"If one considers well", he wrote to Cardinal Cerejeira, "it will be seen that the very sacraments of Baptism and Confirmation impose, amongst other obligations, this Apostolate of Catholic Action". It will be obvious, therefore, that any organised and voluntary work of the laity for the good of souls, such as the apostolate of the members of the St. Vincent de Paul Society on behalf of the poor, may well be an exercise of the priestly powers received in the sacrament of Confirmation. But not every charitable work of the laity, even though it be of a highly apostolic nature, is a participation in the Apostolate of the Hierarchy. A lay apostolic activity does not become Catholic Action until an official mandate is given by the Pope, or the Bishop of the diocese, to undertake a specific work as a share in the Hierarchy's Apostolate. The Bishops of Australia have given this formal mandate to several specialised activities, such as the Rural Movement, the Young Christian Workers, the National Catholic Girls' Movement, and others. The members of these Catholic Action movements are therefore exercising their priestly character as confirmed Christians, and at the same time by special mandate, they are actively and formally sharing in the commission given by Christ to His Apostles at the foundation of the Church. It is important to keep this point clearly in our minds when discussing the essential nature of Catholic Action. It is only by the mandate from the Bishop that an activity of the laity becomes engrafted on to, or incorporated into the Divinely given mission of the Bishops of the Catholic Church. We may therefore call the mandate of the Bishop the

external and formal cause of Catholic Action. A formal cause is one that gives to a thing its peculiar and specific nature. In the case under consideration, it is the mandate of the Bishop which gives to the layman's activity its essential character as Catholic Action, distinguishing it from every other zealous work for the good of souls.

### THE MANDATE.

I have said that the Bishop's mandate is the external formal cause of Catholic Action, for, of course, the mandate does not make the Catholic Actionist *able* to be an apostle. He has that already by virtue of the characters received in the sacraments of Baptism and Confirmation. The mandate elevates his apostolic work, and engrafts it upon the Apostolate of those who possess the fullness of Christ's Priesthood. There is an analogy for this distinction to be found in the Sacrament of Holy Orders. The ordination of a priest does not immediately give him the right to hear confessions, or administer the other sacraments indiscriminately to the faithful. He indeed possesses the power to do so by the character of the Sacrament of Holy Orders to which he was recently ordained. But since absolution from sins is an authoritative act, an exercise of judgment and of government, the young priest needs also what is called jurisdiction. That is to say, the Bishop, who has ordinary jurisdiction over souls within a diocese, must give him a share in the government of souls within a particular locality, and authorise him to exercise the authority of the priesthood within certain limits. The Bishop's action in granting a young priest faculties to exercise his sacerdotal powers within the diocese is the priest's "Mandate", and many of the priest's acts would be invalid without this mandate. A piece of gold is always gold, yet that does not make it a sovereign. It must receive the imprint of the minter's die, which is something accidental to gold, but essential to a sovereign. In like manner, the Bishop's mandate gives to the already apostolic powers of the layman a new orientation, a new perfection, by engrafting his apostolic work on to that of the Hierarchy. For this reason Catholic Action is a purely spiritual apostolate for the salvation of souls and the extension of the Kingdom of Christ, and can never become a political activity. The mandate, in itself, is something accidental to the radical right to work for souls, which the layman has by his Confirmation, but it is essential to his commission as a Catholic Actionist. We are now in a position to answer the frequently recurring question:—How do the laity participate in the Apostolate given by Christ to His Apostles, and

to their successors, the Bishops of the Catholic Church? The answer is that they enjoy the radical right to be apostles by the quasi-ordination of their Confirmation, but their apostolic activity formally participates in that of the Hierarchy when they receive the Bishop's mandate to undertake a specific work for souls, as co-operators with the Hierarchy in building up the Body of Christ.

### ORATORICAL INACCURACIES.

In the literature of Catholic Action one occasionally meets with loose and grossly misleading expressions on the question of this participation by Catholic Actionists in the Apostolate of the Hierarchy. One must be on one's guard against the danger of sacrificing theological accuracy for the sake of rhetoric. For example, I once heard a well-known preacher tell an audience that Pope Pius XI had opened the doors of the priesthood to the laity. The Holy Father did nothing of the kind. No Pope can change the Divinely established Constitution of the Church. If the laity have a share in the Priesthood of Christ, they have it from Christ Himself, not from any Pope. It was the Divine Head of the Mystical Body who gave His Character to the sacraments of Baptism and Confirmation; the Holy Father has called upon you to exercise the powers already inherent in you by the reception of these sacraments. You may read another instance of misleading rhetoric in the second volume of an American work, entitled "*A Call to Catholic Action*", (pag. 18). The statement is by a well-known and distinguished preacher of the United States. "Baptism", he wrote, "incorporates us into Christ the King, for it makes us citizens of His Kingdom. Confirmation incorporates us into Christ the Teacher, for it strengthens us to fight for the truth of that Kingdom. Holy Orders incorporates us into Christ the Priest, making us ministers of His Sacrifice". There are several errors in this apparently innocent statement. As I have endeavoured to explain in this paper, each of the three sacraments mentioned by our author incorporates us into the *Priesthood* of Christ, but to a different degree. Nor can it be said with theological accuracy that Confirmation incorporates the laity into the office of Christ the Teacher. The Magisterium, or Power to Teach, was conferred by Christ upon His Apostles, and resides in the Sovereign Pontiff and the Hierarchy, as the *Ecclesia Docens*, or Teaching Church. To this Teaching Church our Blessed Lord promised the infallible guidance of His Holy Spirit until the end of time. It is perfectly clear that the laity do not participate in the *Ecclesia Docens*—the Teaching



Church—by being invited to collaborate with the Hierarchy in the work of saving souls. The authority to teach, the power to govern, and the powers of the Priesthood are three distinct commissions given by Our Blessed Lord to His Church. The first two authorities are exclusive to the successors of the Apostles, whilst the latter is shared by the laity only to that degree which Our Lord Himself determined by the characters of the sacraments.

### SPIRITUAL URANIUM.

If you have followed my reasoning to this point, I should not be under any great necessity to conclude this paper by a lengthy appeal to you to become active participants in the apostolate of Catholic Action. The Confirmation Character indelibly imprinted on your souls is your permanent consecration to this apostolate. You already possess within you a dynamism of intense spiritual power, and your educational advantages greatly enhance your powers of personal influence. Nor is the apostolic mandate lacking. At their last meeting, the Bishops' Committee, which directs Catholic Action for the Hierarchy of Australia, issued a mandate for the specialised activity of Catholic Action amongst the students and graduates of our Universities. It is their earnest desire that those, who have been privileged to receive the special intellectual formation, which a university education provides, should no longer continue, like the unprofitable servant of the Gospel, to preserve their talents locked within their own breasts, but should trade with their gifts in the cause of the Master, from whom they have been received.

We live in the atomic age. The appallingly destructive power that lies in the heart of nature's elements has suddenly been revealed to our generation, and as a natural reaction, the researches of scientists are now directed towards the harnessing of this amazing energy for the benefit, rather than for the destruction of man. In the spiritual sphere, our university men and women are surely the spiritual uranium of the Church, charged with a specially powerful radioactive force, capable of destroying error, and of energising the inert mass of our unregenerate society. I earnestly hope that one of the best fruits of this National Conference will be the conversion of this potential energy into a driving force, whose spiritual influence will soon be felt within the Body of Christ.

+ JUSTIN D. SIMONDS, D.D.

# Apostles of To-morrow

## VII. THE DISCIPLESHIP OF CHRIST DEMANDS SPIRITUAL FITNESS.

### *A: Two Modern Apostles of Education.*

Spiritual fitness means the pursuit of holiness. Personal holiness distilled from the knowledge of a Living God can change us so that men will recognise us as disciples of Christ. Christ came "to cast fire upon earth", and we Catholic educators, parent, teacher, priest, are called to kindle anew and spread the fire of spirituality. The fire of God's love propels us, and the children through us, to launch a programme of apostolic action, wherein we shall find the courage to face our own faults, and the will to climb the heights of holiness.

Nineteen hundred years ago, Christ Our Lord taught us that sanctity begins with a knowledge of God, revealing to us His infinite goodness so overwhelmingly that we gladly surrender to Him the full force and capacity of our intellects and wills, sweeping into that mighty sacrifice every lesser object of knowledge or desire. Holiness ends with a crowning love of God expressing itself in boundless generosity of action, word, and thought towards Him and all His creatures. We cannot serve creatures or use them to our peace and salvation unless we love God. We cannot love Him unless we know Him. "Now this", said Our Lord in His prayer, "is everlasting life, that they may know Thee".

Holiness of life is our vocation; we dare not fail. The light must shine, the salt must season, the shepherd must lead. We need not pray that we may attain the heights of learning nor win the applause of visible success, but that we may be saturated with, and help others to achieve, that sanctity of life which flows from the knowledge and love of God.

Father in heaven, that we may know Thee! May wisdom be our portion, for "there is a wisdom more precious than riches", says the Book of Proverbs, "and all the things that are desired are not to be compared with her. . . . . Her ways are beautiful ways, and all her paths are peaceable. She is a tree of life to them that lay hold on her and he that shall retain her is blessed". (Prov. iii-17-18.)

May we think, speak, and act that the children committed to our care may see in our personal lives the seal of spirituality.

May we learn to know and love God so well that we shall become

the very likeness of God, responding to His Will as a shadow responds to the movements of its substance.

To inspire us on our way, let us listen to two modern apostles of Catholic education who put personal holiness as the goal of all our educational activities. The one stresses that at the high school and college level. The other has the primary or grade school in mind. Both speak with the conviction of a voice from above and beyond this earth. *"To teach the truth that is in Jesus Christ"*.

"The reality that is Jesus Christ is the definition, the very heart and soul, of the education you graduates have received. It is the reason for this college. Catholic schools exist for the purpose of teaching the truth that is in Jesus Christ, Our Lord, and teaching all truth in relation to that truth. Apart from that truth all other truth is meaningless. Christ is the light of which all other light is but a reflection; where it does not shine there is darkness".

These words were spoken by one of America's foremost Catholic educators, the late Monsignor George Johnson, Professor of Education at the Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C., and Secretary of the National Catholic Welfare Conference's Department of Education. They are taken from the unfinished Commencement or Graduation address delivered to the women graduates of Trinity College, Washington, D.C., in June, 1944.

Dr. Johnson knew the American school thoroughly, for his name had appeared on many official committees and boards commissioned to study and report on various aspects of education. He met the men who are formulating the educational philosophy of the United States, and he interprets that philosophy thus: "Outside of the Church, education becomes increasingly a stranger to Christ and the things of Christ. It has lost all understanding of the meaning of the supernatural. Absorbed in the human, it neglects the divine. It exalts the practical and is impatient of the speculative. It has some interest in Christ as an historical personage, and in Christianity as a social or cultural movement. It knows nothing of Christ as a determining force in human society, as the eternal and abiding reality".

That interpretation is true also of that education, free, compulsory, and secular, which the State provides in Australia.

Dr. Johnson saw the strength and resources of the State School. "Secular education is a powerful factor in the life of a nation. It is making us the kind of people we are becoming. It has great resources



of wealth and talent and equipment at its command. In comparison, our Catholic effort seems weak and utterly inadequate. We have our moments of dismay, at times even of discouragement”.

Humanly speaking, we are in a bad way, facing as we do the competition of the State-directed school. Dr. Johnson continues: “The odds against us seem so tremendous. We are out of tune with the times; we are in conscience bound to keep out of tune with the times. The temptation comes to accommodate ourselves to circumstances, to yield a bit here, to make a compromise there. The reality to which we are committed has a way of seeming very unreal when faced with the realities the world cherishes. We are different, and being different can be very uncomfortable”.

Yes, indeed, and to remain uncomfortable is too big a price for some to pay, so they surrender to the realities the world cherishes, or live a compromise. Dr. Johnson had met them. “Too often we are forced to admit that the prospect of being forever different is too galling for some of our graduates to face, and we find them after a number of years being very realistic and not taking their religion too seriously. They still profess to be Catholics, but their deeds—their economic deeds, their political deeds, their artistic deeds, their literary deeds, their domestic deeds—reveal that whatever their lips may say, their hearts are far from Christ. They have become too realistic to be governed by reality”.

Such is the cold, naked, bitter truth. But we can do more for youth still with us if we strive to make Christ better known to our children. Dr. Johnson says to us: “We still have a lot to learn about educating unto Christ in a world that knows not Christ”. At this point in his address, Dr. Johnson collapsed and died. The last word spoken by Monsignor Johnson was the sacred Name of Christ. It was a fitting end to one whose whole life was devoted to restoring the Catholic School and all associated with it to Christ.

On saying those words, he was seen to lift his right hand as if to gesture. He stopped suddenly, seemed about to fall and grasped the stand at which he was speaking. The stand appeared about to topple over. Mgr. Johnson straightened up as if to keep from falling, and then fell to the floor at the feet of Dr. Curley, Archbishop of Baltimore, who was presiding. The Archbishop asked if there were any doctors present, and immediately gave Mgr. Johnson absolution. Several doctors in the audience rushed up, but it was seen that Mgr. Johnson

was beyond recall. He was pronounced dead ten minutes after Father Burggraff had anointed him.

*Personal Reminiscences:*

When I enrolled in the Catholic University in the post-graduate school of education in 1926, Dr. Johnson was my Professor, and I got to know him intimately. At that time he was in charge of the parish school near the University Campus. I went there every week to observe the teaching. What remains with me still are the echoes of Dr. Johnson's thanksgiving after the children's Mass on Sundays. His formal address consisted of a few words, very few, just a reference to the Mass of the day, and then kneeling with them he prayed aloud as a simple, devoted son to a loving Father. Using words which the children use, he invited Our Blessed Lord to join His children, and spoke as if his faith had soared into vision, and we students present felt as if the living Christ stood there at the Communion rail smiling at us all. In the classes he conducted in the practice school, he had the same power of bringing Christ to the children, of opening the eyes of their souls to see Him alive, standing there before them, waiting upon their invitation to come and take each one of them in a loving embrace. Dr. Johnson's ardent love of Christ illuminated his intellect to glimpse the wisdom of the Master's words: "Suffer little children to come unto Me, and forbid them not".

The field of his labours as an educator were broad and varied like the movements of a great symphony which runs up and down the scale of human emotions. His official positions as Professor of Education at the Catholic University, as the spokesman on education for the American Hierarchy, as Education Secretary of the National Catholic Educational Association, and his editorship of the *Catholic Education Review* gave him an unique opportunity to influence and inspire the leaders of Catholic Education in North America, and in other lands, through the publications of these bodies. Like a recurring theme in the symphony of his labours comes again and again his appeal to show Christ as He is to the children, for once the children see and hear Christ, they will surrender themselves at once, and for ever, to the most winning of the sons of men. How fitting that the last note in that glorious symphony of work for and among children should be the lovely Name of Christ, the Name sacred to Dr. Johnson, the builder of character, the Name in which he found all that he needed, a star to steer by, a goal to aim at, a purpose to inspire him. That challenging

Name of Christ showed him into what channels he must pour his enormous fund of energy.

*Words from beyond the grave:*

From out of the grave he continues his address, which the women graduates of Trinity College, Washington D.C., did not hear, for his lips were closed upon the sweet Name of Christ. He promises us no primrose path, no easy going, no quick results. "It is by no means a simple matter to develop in the hearts of the young a zealous loyalty to the unchanging, when they have to live in the midst of change. It is by no means a simple matter to impress upon carefree youth the necessity of building up the reserves of fortitude they will need for the daily martyrdom of living a Christian life in an atmosphere in which Christianity is unfashionable". But there's no room for despondency in this lover of Christ.

"Of course, we are not working alone. There is always the grace of God and the guidance of the Holy Spirit. We succeed more often than we fail. Yet our success should not and does not blind us to our failure". When the Catholic teachers do their part, there is still the duty of the Catholic alumnus or past pupil to share the task of bringing Christ back to His people.

"The responsibility of a Catholic graduate is to make her contemporaries increasingly conscious of Jesus Christ, to insinuate Him into society. This she does by making Him real in the circles in which she moves by living as Christ would live in her. This she does by translating the faith that is in her into deeds and action that are in conformity with the spirit of Christ and calculated to win the world to Him".

Sitting with the first educationalists of the United States at many a conference table, Dr. Johnson learned that these leaders considered themselves realists. To that challenge Dr. Johnson replies: "The realist is impatient of creeds and symbols. He claims they have no functional value. It is incumbent upon the Christian, particularly if that Christian has had the advantage of a college education, under Christian auspices, to prove that he is wrong. Our creed is not just a series of empty formulas strung together. Our symbols are not vain window-dressing. We are what we believe, and the signs of our faith are the signs of our character".

The final words that reach us from the grave of Dr. Johnson, words his human lips never uttered, but words which were the motto of his life, and the echoes of his spirit after death, are: "The noblest



of all our symbols is the Cross. Christianity is utterly unrealistic as to teach that the only way to find your life is to lose it".

And let us pass on to the children through their parents, their priests, and their teachers, this message from an American priest whose life was true to Christ, and whose teaching began and ended with that holy Name.

"The best, the truest, the most substantial advice that can be given to a Catholic graduate is this: Go forth and die. Die to yourself; die to the world; die to greed; die to calculating ambition; die to all the unrealities that the world calls real. Die and you shall live, and live abundantly".

*"To teach them to be religious":*

Another lover of children speaks to us from the grave. The late Archbishop Michael Sheehan, Co-adjutor Archbishop of Sydney for 15 years, who died in Dublin on March 1st, 1945, has many claims to be heard. His two text books, *"A Child's Book of Religion I & II"*, and *"Apologetics and Catholic Doctrine I & II"*,\* were tested in the white heat of classroom practice for many years before they were issued. That personal holiness is his hope for the child under our instruction is apparent from both texts, and is specifically stated in the preface which I will comment upon.

"The aim of this book is not only to teach children their religion, but also to teach them to be religious; not only to teach them what they must believe and do in order to be saved, but also to help them to love Our Lord and Saviour with a great personal love, and to love the Church which He founded. It is hoped that, with this twofold purpose vividly present to their minds, parents and teachers will regard the class for religious instruction as a mission to the children, as an opportunity not only to enlighten the understanding, but also to capture the will, and that, therefore, they will avoid the secular manner, and all severity and impatience".—Archbishop Sheehan's Preface to *"A Child's Book of Religion"*.

Archbishop Sheehan's valuable contribution to Catechetics, *"A Child's Book of Religion"*, Parts I & II, was ushered into the Catholic home and school by the above words, golden words that offer to the parent, the teacher, and the priest, fruitful material for meditation. Surely we can say that every Catholic home, school, and parochial church aims "not only to teach children their religion, but also to teach

---

\*Both text books are published by M. H. Gill & Sons, Dublin.

them to be religious". An obvious distinction, one may comment, but like the obvious, a distinction that has been, and is largely ignored. We have worried ourselves so much over what we are to teach in religion, and how we are to teach it, that the more important point, why we are teaching religion, has been neglected somewhat. These words of Archbishop Sheehan are a challenge, and we dare not pass them by unanswered. All that we have learned in pedagogical literature about the difference between education and instruction should help us to realise more fully that the opening sentence of that preface is a succinct statement of the ideals of the Catholic philosophy of education. The instructor instructs, and his class accumulates facts and information. The educator goes much deeper; his is the long view; his eyes turn towards the horizon of the after-school years, and he moulds, forms, and fashions the whole child to face the present, and to prepare for what is coming.

*"A Mission to Children".*

In the religious period His Grace indicates how that may be done by regarding the class for religious instruction "as a mission to the children", as an opportunity not only to enlighten the understanding, but also to capture the will. That is admirable. We all know what a mission is, and what graces come on such an occasion. The active life of Our Lord was a continuous mission. Through the parables He taught men to think, and as a result many walked His way of life. In that parable way of teaching we can distinguish three steps: 1. He begins by interesting His audience. He captures their attention by an experience. He unfreezes them by a story. 2. Then comes His instruction, definite, practical, to the point; and 3. finally, He applies the lesson, and sets their minds working out the application to suit themselves, and thus He moves them. I am not advocating a return to a framework of steps in the Herbartian manner, but I do believe that the religion period in every class will improve if teachers keep these three points ever in mind. Of the three we are most attentive to the second, to instruct; we have not quite neglected the first, to interest, but we have had only a partial success in the third, to move.

It has been a rare delight to me to go carefully through the lessons in *"A Child's Book of Religion"* and see how adeptly His Grace translates into classroom practice the ideal of making religious instruction a "mission to the children". Any lesson will illustrate this. For example, Lesson V, "The story of Our First Parents". The lesson

opens interestingly. The instruction explains why eating the forbidden fruit was a sin. I can recall my feelings as a child that God was unduly severe on Adam and Eve just for taking a bite out of an apple. The Bible Histories do not enlighten one as His Grace does: "They ate the forbidden fruit because they wanted to be as great as God, and to get the better of Him, which was very wicked". Every child can grasp that, and immediately see that Adam and Eve fully deserved to be cast out of Paradise. In this, as in most of the lessons, the application is a prayer, simple and moving—"Help me, dear God, to be always obedient to You. Help me to thank You as I ought. Help me to love You with my whole heart and soul. Amen".

*"For use in the Home and the School".*

"We must give the children a reading-book on Religion which they can handle themselves with little or no assistance, a book which will state doctrine clearly, explain it simply and naturally, give a sufficient amount of Sacred History, and put in permanent form the exhortations which, if communicated merely by the spoken word, may perish in the ears that hear them. Others doubtless will surpass my feeble effort, but the lines which I have followed are, I think, sound". (Preface V.)

On the title page the author puts at the top of the page—"For use in the Home and the School", and the order is not accidental. In one of the preliminary notices His Grace stated that he contemplated naming his text-book: "A Bush Mother's Catechism". The home comes first, and its influence sinks deeper, and lasts longer than the school. The Approved Catechism has never been a favourite in the home circle. The mother is afraid of it. Little Tom may shoot more difficult questions at her, if he has the armoury of the Catechism, with its archaic words, at his disposal. To save her blushes she avoids the Catechism. She has a Bible History, and the stories appeal, but she feels that there is not enough instruction in the stories, or she is unable to extract it.

Archbishop Sheehan has given us a book for every teaching mother in the land, a book that she will take up with delight, and her children gathered around her will love that evening's class with mother, and look forward to it. When I first read "*A Child's Book of Religion*", I wrote immediately to His Grace asking him for a thousand copies for our Bushies' Scheme, in the Archdiocese of Perth, W.A. He kindly acknowledged my impulsive note and directed me to the publishers.



*A Supplementary Reader to the Catechism:*

Does "*A Child's Book of Religion*" fulfil the high aim of its author, a book for home and school, a book which guides parents and teachers how to teach, and a book through which the child can teach himself? I am convinced that it does.

The responsibility of the religious formation of the child does not fall exclusively on the school. No, the home and the parish church must share it. All three will fail, however, unless the child takes a hand in educating himself. We forget sometimes that no one can really educate anyone else. Parents, teachers, and priests may guide and direct, but in the long run every individual educates himself.

The practical question arises: Is this book a better instrument in guiding the child to acquire holiness of life than the Catechism? The author pays just tribute to the theological accuracy of the professionally-worded definitions of the "technical catechism" in common use in our schools. The theologian editors constructed definitions which fit the truth exactly. Their object was to express in definitions and clear statement the truth in question, leaving the task of simplifying the text, of adding exhortations, and of encouraging the spirit of piety to the teachers. But what a task to set parent and teacher, neither of whom possess that professional knowledge that went to the making of such definitions and statements of doctrine! It is too much to expect from the average parent and teacher. Dr. Sheehan summarises the situation:

"Many bishops nowadays are of opinion that, in the absence of an official direction to the contrary, the technical catechism, when prescribed, need not be regarded as necessarily excluding a substitute, or as imposing any particular method of instruction; they hold that, though it shows us *what* we should teach, it need not be taken as showing us *how* we should teach. This book, however, is not concerned with any particular attitude towards the technical catechism, and may be used conjointly with it or independently of it". (Preface VIII.)

"*A Child's Book of Religion*" has not received the success it deserves, because it was offered as a substitute for the approved Catechism. I believe both are complementary, and advocate "*A Child's Book of Religion*" as a reader that will be welcomed in every home, in town and country, a reader that will win its way to the heart of the child, and that will lead him to appreciate, as never before, the succinct, accurate wording of the Catechism answers.

We can lift "*A Child's Book of Religion*" up among the books which child and parent enjoy, provided it is never a prescribed text for

examination within the classroom or on the occasion of the diocesan inspector's visit.

*A Tribute to Archbishop Sheehan :*

The late Archbishop Sheehan was a shy, retiring man, and the idea of a memorial would never have met his approval. But I believe that I can suggest some tribute to his unceasing care for the little ones of Christ that would have pleased him. His course of correspondence lessons issued as "Religion by Letter" assures us that the children in the country, too far from Catholic Church and school, were dear to him. My suggestion is that their Lordships the Bishops of Australia and New Zealand should acquire the rights to publish "*A Child's Book of Religion*" in Australasia. Then may a shower of these books fall upon the homes in our distant and scattered settlements, and keep falling until every mother in the country has a copy in her hands. Did we know that this book was in a home in the out-backs, we could improve our correspondence teaching by correlating our lessons with the lessons in "*A Child's Book of Religion*". Having acquired the rights, the book could be printed and published in Australia, and issued at a much lower figure than at present.

One of our most difficult duties as parish priests is to instruct and move careless parents, who listen grudgingly to our preaching whenever they come to Mass. Let us tackle the problem obliquely through the children, by arming them with "*A Child's Book of Religion*" to arouse the lukewarm home. If the children succeed in getting the parents reading the book with them, we can hope for better homes. Perhaps we might invade the careless home through the St. Vincent de Paul Society, hinting that "*A Child's Book of Religion*" should accompany that parcel of clothes into a home that needs spiritual as well as material assistance.

J. T. McMAHON.

# Catholic Principles on Sex - Instruction

Every Catholic should have some knowledge of Catholic principles regarding sex-instruction, whether in the home or in the school or by indiscriminate public lectures, for it is one of the greatest of educational problems to-day.

Firstly, consider prevailing conditions. We are living in an age which is reaping the fruits of secular education. And our Catholic children must go out into a world in which multitudes of people have lost their religious convictions, and very many even their moral standards. It is a simple fact that Christian standards of morality, as we know them to be, are very widely disregarded even if any longer recognised at all. Immorality is glorified in our newspapers and books, by blatant advertising, in commercialised entertainments on the stage, or by films, and even over the air. Every effort is made to stimulate a feverish hunger for excitement, and to destroy all sense of Christian values.

The result is a breakdown of morals, crowded divorce courts, the breaking up of family life, and an outbreak of juvenile delinquency which is a worry even to the irreligious world itself. But the irreligious world is not worried by any sense of guilt before God. It is worried only by social consequences. And for that reason it looks round for remedies.

We agree with the world that a remedy is needed. But we can't agree with the kind of remedy the world proposes. For the world is obsessed with the idea that sex-instruction in the schools is the cure. In England, the Board of Education has published a manual of sex-instruction for use in schools, holding that if children are only taught the facts of life, beginning with nature study and working through to human physiology and biology, they will get over their timidity and false modesty. They will become very matter-of-fact, and sensible, and will want to behave decently.

Now Catholics will have nothing to do with the proposed remedy. They denounce it. They declare that sex-instruction given collectively and indiscriminately in schools or anywhere else, is wrong in principle, and will be disastrous in its results. And the world is very puzzled by our attitude. It asks us whether we are interested in preserving our



children from moral disaster. We reply that we are, and far more interested than the world itself. It then asks us whether we believe simply in a policy of silence, on the score that the children will get to know the facts of life anyhow. We reply that we do not believe "anyhow". We want them to get to know what they need to know in the right way and from the right sources. And collective instruction in school, from school teachers who may not be in the least fitted to impart such knowledge, is not the right way. We Catholics have our own programme and our own methods in educating to purity, and preparing children to face the realities of life. What that programme is we shall see in due course. But our own principles will be much clearer, if we first see what is wrong with the proposals of secular experts.

### KNOWLEDGE NOT VIRTUE.

Having abandoned religious teaching and moral principles, the world refuses to see that the cure of prevailing laxity is to restore these things. It doesn't even dream that part of the remedy would be to abolish the blatant incitements to immorality that confront us on all sides. Instead, it argues that our religious and moral prejudices adopted a hush-hush policy about sex problems, refused to talk about them, and left people in ignorance. Its advice, therefore, is to change the policy of silence for a policy of unveiled speech. Make children as familiar with everything to do with sex relationships as with anything else. Then they won't think anything of it, or be more interested in it, than in anything else. Children, then, should be given detailed lessons in the anatomy and physiology of the different sexes, and taught the process of reproduction in all living things from worms and fish to birds and monkeys. Then they will understand that human beings are just the same as other animals. They will know what sex is all about, and will refrain from the abuses so rampant to-day.

These are the theories which the Catholic Church condemns as utterly wrong in principle, and fatal in their consequences. Pope Pius XI declared such ideas stupid and wicked, calculated to teach children how to sin rather than the virtue of living chastely.

For knowledge, mere knowledge, does not mean virtue. If it did, doctors, medical students, and nurses, who know all the physical facts of anatomy and biology, should be an ideal body of men and women. But they are not. As a group, they are not more moral, nor less so, than others.

Again, such a method of education can provide no motive for being good. If children are taught that they are the same as animals, but that they mustn't behave as animals, they will at once ask why not. That's a moral problem, to which biology has no answer.

The secularist also overlooks entirely the fact that original sin has warped human nature, and that knowledge without will training and the grace of God is worse than useless.

He also takes it for granted that the virtue of modesty does not exist, that there is nothing improper in itself, and no reason why we should not deal with any topic in any company. Much therefore is said in the name of frankness which should never be uttered. Ordinary psychology should be enough to tell men that the mind and the imagination greatly affect the body, stimulating its passions. All kinds of distressing conditions can arise through concentrating attention and consciousness on things of which we are not meant to be conscious. We are not meant to be conscious that we have a heart. People have died of heart failure merely because they have been made conscious that they had a heart! But, apart from all this, modesty is a God-given instinct intended to safeguard chastity. It diverts our attention from things that could lead to the violation of chastity. And to destroy the barrier of modesty by public and collective lessons on topics of their very nature suggestive of immoral pleasurable experiences is to leave the door wide open to vice. The Church, therefore, condemns sex-instruction in schools. If any instruction is necessary, it must be given privately, discreetly, and personally by parents, according to the age and needs of each individual child. And even parents must give the information with due reticence, giving explanations sufficient to satisfy a child's curiosity without unduly increasing it. As a matter of fact, the true approach to this whole problem is not intellectual and physical, but moral and spiritual, as we shall see.

### SOCIAL DISEASES.

Another fallacy in the secular approach to the problem of purity lies in its appeal to fear of consequences. To try to get people to exercise self-restraint, recourse is had to a campaign of general enlightenment concerning the dire results in the individual and to society, if the vice of immorality is allowed to rage unchecked. Now it is true that nature itself, and that means God Himself, has attached dreadful penalties to loose conduct, afflicting both those guilty of it and their children. But if the Health authorities think they can stamp out ex-

cessive immorality by launching a special campaign against it based on the fear of the consequences, just as they would launch a special campaign against tuberculosis, they are very much mistaken. In any case, fear of consequences does not mean virtue. The murderer who refrains from murder only because he fears to be hanged has as little virtue as the man who kills. His dispositions are no different. Fear of consequences means a morality of expediency. It leaves the impression that it doesn't matter what you do, if you can but be prudent enough to escape the results of your conduct. It doesn't make a person one bit more moral. Virtue is self-restraint for the love of God. And sin is not a mere matter of social disorder, though social disorders follow from it. Sin is an offence against God, poisoning one's relationships with God. And so long as the ideas of sin and of virtue are omitted from one's treatment of this subject, all efforts to reform humanity will prove futile. All true virtue means self-restraint based on a positive love of goodness. And, of course, that brings in the question of conscience and the sense of guilt in violating the spiritual ideals one feels obliged to love and observe.

#### MORAL GUILT.

The preceding ideas awaken the protests of secularists. Modern psychologists and psychiatrists, repudiating religion, deny the idea of sin, and say that the sense of guilt does more harm than anything else. They declare that it makes people neurotic, and intensifies their obsession. Constant worry keeps the problem alive in their minds, and if people could be freed from any sense of guilt, they would think of the subject far less often, and recover from their acute nervous state. Many of these specialists go on from there to say that all modesty and sense of shame are but prudery and hypocrisy.

But the result of their teaching would simply be the destruction of conscience itself; and Catholics could not for a moment accept their theories. We do not hold that there is nothing in what they say. But they go too far, and much of what they say is positively false. Modesty, as we have seen, is a natural inborn instinct protecting people from many more serious temptations against chastity. And if it be a natural instinct, it is fatal to aim at breaking it down. Moreover, the interior sense of guilt which follows upon violations of chastity is the voice of conscience, and one has not the right to stifle that voice.

What the psychologists fail to do is to distinguish between the will and the emotions. The sense of guilt combines both the intellectual



knowledge of conduct opposed to the Will of God, and emotional distress arising from the sense of shame. Exaggerated emotional distress can be a hindrance rather than a help, making a person quite neurotic. It often proceeds from wounded self-love and pride, or from fear; and does not always indicate genuine contrition. The test of genuine contrition is the resolve on the part of the will to try to avoid the same sin in the future, and to take the necessary means as well as avoiding the occasion. Nervous disorders do not arise from that; and the remedy for such nervous disorders is, not to destroy all sense of guilt, but to substitute a reasonable resolution for tears. Very often emotional distress is out of all proportion to the degree of actual guilt, and that is harmful.

There are lessons here for us in dealing with children. If children say or do things we know to be wrong, we must base our corrections, reproaches, and punishments on their degree of knowledge, not on ours. And we must be slow to impute grave moral fault. Punishment or severity beyond a child's own sense of guilt makes it jump to the conclusion that what it thought trivial was shockingly bad; and that is often the beginning of an anxiety neurosis or complex which may lead to scruples, or possibly to despair. Forbearance, kindly advice, and sympathetic help are much better than severe punishment out of all proportion to a child's sense of guilt. If we act on what we think of things, and not on the child's apprehension of them, we behave in a way the child can't understand, and fill it with fear. And, as we have seen, fear is not the road to virtue. Love of God, and a deep desire to be pleasing to Him, is the only real road; and that requires the building up of ideals.

#### CATHOLIC PRINCIPLES.

For the guidance of Catholics in this matter many decisions have been given by the Holy See, within the broad outlines of which we must construct our programme.

In the various documents issued by Rome, public, collective, and indiscriminate sex-instruction given to children in school or elsewhere, is condemned.

In Catholic schools, children must be given a sound religious instruction, urged to be faithful to prayer and the reception of the Sacraments, and have instilled into them a deep personal love of Our Lord and Our Lady.

The highest esteem must be developed within them for the positive virtue of holy purity.

They must be taught to avoid the occasions of sin, dangerous reading, indecent amusements, and bad company.

They must be made to realise that a Christian life is impossible without some degree of self-denial and mortification. It is impossible to live a pure and chaste life if one is quite unmortified and yields to unrestrained self-indulgence in all other departments of one's existence. There is no substitute for some degree of Christian asceticism or efforts at self-conquest.

Finally, if any factual instructions are to be given to children, the responsibility belongs to the parents, not to school teachers.

Such are the main features of the Catholic position in this matter, and of each we must say a few words.

### NEED OF RELIGION.

We must be convinced that no merely natural means can preserve chastity. The Pope has said that, to rely upon merely natural means without the support of religion and piety is both stupid and dangerous. And the fact that the moral breakdown has accompanied a progressive driftage from religion both in knowledge and practice should have made the world realise this. But there are none so blind as those who will not see.

The Church, however, does not leave us in doubt. Our main weapon is still a sound religious and moral formation. Man is not merely a "rational animal". He is a "child of God", and to live as a child of God he needs grace. For to live as a child of God one cannot live for immediate sensual and animal gratification. One must learn to sacrifice that in favour of spiritual ideals.

To get the necessary grace, fidelity to prayer and the Sacraments is essential, whilst personal love for Our Lord and Our Lady will alone give the inspiration necessary to make one really want to live up to Christian ideals.

### ESTEEM FOR CHASTITY.

As regards the virtue of purity in particular, all Papal instructions insist that we dwell far more upon the virtue than upon the vice opposed to it. We must instil an esteem for the angelic virtue of purity, making the children realise how God loves it, how Our Lady and all the Saints exemplified it, how all good people respect it, and how it safeguards our true dignity as children of God.

But the only way really to instil this esteem is to have an enthusiasm for the virtue ourselves, and persuade the children to share it with

us. That is the art of teaching anything. The teacher who imparts no enthusiasm for his subject, no matter what it is, is a bad teacher. The children must feel, when we speak of holy purity, that we are directing their attention to something for which we care very deeply. It's not a question of winning the admiration of the children for ourselves, but of making them admire something we ourselves admire.

At the same time, we must make it clear that virtue is not merely admiration of a beautiful ideal. Virtue supposes victory over temptation. There's no virtue in keeping one's temper when there's no excuse to lose it. And the same holds true of very virtue. To practise the virtue of purity, we must learn to practise custody of the eyes, and to watch over our imagination, thoughts, words, and actions, keeping them sweet and clean and pure, and avoiding all that we feel might corrupt them.

#### NEED OF AN INCENTIVE.

Yet, here again, the question arises as to what will impel us to do all this. Mere teaching, legislation, and efforts at compulsion will fail hopelessly. We need an incentive that will enable us to rise above lower inclinations, sacrifice them, and master them. Only love of Our Lord and of Our Lady and of all that is spiritual can do that. The body is most sacred when it is most forgotten and subordinated to the soul. Even in the natural order, love of the music he is trying to interpret makes a conductor forget his body, even whilst using it. He is lost in his love and interest awakened by the music itself. And chastity is the certain result of being lost in the love of Our Lord and Our Lady and of heavenly things. Only as they are forgotten does one become really aware of the body asserting its own animal claims.

From all this it is clear that it is not so much information as formation of character, of the mind and heart and will in the light of Christian principles, that is wanted. And the programme set out above covers all the normal grounding that it is possible to give in our schools. Any training beyond this should be given by parents.

#### THE DUTY OF PARENTS.

Parents have an inescapable duty to provide such sex-enlightenment as is necessary for the proper training and formation of their children. That this is the primary duty of parents should be obvious. Such knowledge must be given little by little right through child-life, gradually and unnoticed, in as matter of fact a way as possible, with no emotional disturbance.



In the family, the sense of reverence for a good father and mother creates its own impression. Any subsequent cheapening of the topic by outsiders is then viewed with resentment and disgust. Moreover, if the parents do their duty in this matter, the children will turn to them with confidence in any perplexity and danger; and they could not turn to anyone better.

Unfortunately, most parents are both unable and unwilling to do their duty in this matter. They altogether neglect it, and allow their children to worry over things happening to them which they can't understand, or to pick up what they can as best they can. In either case, a vast amount of preventible human misery results. Children don't know how to deal, on a sound and healthy basis, with sex inclinations, as these gradually manifest their claims.

For this reason, Pope Pius XI implored priests to use every means, by words and writings widely publicised, to instruct Christian parents, both in general and in particular, regarding their duties in the religious, moral, and civic education of their children, explaining the best methods to be adopted.

#### POPE'S PERSONAL ADVICE.

In October, 1941, recalling the instructions of Pope Pius XI, his successor, Pope Pius XII, addressed an audience of Christian mothers in Rome.

He begged them to begin to teach their children self-mastery from their earliest years. By a loving look or a warning word, he said, even quite small children must be taught not to yield to all their impressions and sensations, but to learn to sort them out, and realise which may be indulged and which should be ignored. Thus, under the guidance of parents, children begin their own education.

"Train also the minds of your children", the Pope added. "Do not give them wrong ideas, or wrong reasons for things. Whatever their questions may be, do not answer them with evasions, or untrue statements which their minds rarely accept".

The Holy Father's words touch on a very important subject. Little children, in all innocence, will ask where babies come from. It is the most natural question in the world. Yet few parents face the question sensibly. If they tell lies and say that "the stork brought them", or "that one buys them from the doctor and that he brings them in his bag", the children may be satisfied or put off for the moment. But the lie is eventually discovered, and the parents are not trusted again

in such matters. The child henceforth looks elsewhere for information.

Or, again, if parents stammer, and look awkward and embarrassed, the child feels there's something wrong. Why is it rude and naughty to ask questions about something in regard to which one is naturally curious?

Parents could, of course, say quietly and calmly, "You are too small yet to understand. Ask me another time when you are bigger, and I will tell you all about it". A child will probably be satisfied with that, because it feels that it will know in due course, and is prepared to forget the subject for the time being. But if a mother does explain things, she should tell the truth that a baby is formed within its mother, as the Infant Jesus within the womb of the Virgin Mary. The child won't fully understand; but the linking of the explanation with something it does know—the Hail Mary—and the fact that it has been told where the baby comes from, will generally satisfy curiosity. That's all it really wanted to know, and for the time being it is not curious about processes.

#### TRANSITION TO ADOLESCENCE.

But Pope Pius XII says that new problems arise as the child approaches adolescence. From the age of twelve onwards the transition to maturity begins, and the childish heart feels new impulses stirring within it. New interests are awakened. Both physical and psychological changes take place. And it is then that the sense of modesty is called upon as never before to exert its protective influence. But here I cannot do better than quote the Pope's own words.

"Christian mothers", he said, "when new desires begin to disturb the serenity of your children's earlier years, remember that to train the heart means to train the will to resist the attacks of evil and the insidious temptations of passion. During that period of transition from the unconscious purity of infancy to the triumphant purity of adolescence, you have a task of the highest importance to fulfil. You have to prepare your sons and daughters so that they may pass with unfaltering step through that time of crisis and physical change without losing anything of the joy of innocence, preserving intact that natural instinct of modesty Providence has given them as a check on wayward passions. That sense of modesty, which in its spontaneous abhorrence of the impure is akin to the sense of religion, is made of little account in these days. But you, mothers, will take care that

your children do not lose it through indecency in dress and self-adornment, through unbecoming familiarities, or immoral spectacles. On the contrary, you will seek to make it more delicate and alert. You will keep a watchful eye on their steps. You will not suffer the whiteness of their souls to be stained and contaminated by corrupt company. You will inspire them with a high esteem and jealous love for purity, advising them to commend themselves to the sure and motherly protection of the Immaculate Virgin”.

In all that, Pope Pius XII outlined the traditional Catholic policy. But in view of the practical needs of these present times, he went further, and dealt with the question of actual sex-instruction, to be given by parents.

#### EXPLAINING THE FACTS OF LIFE.

“Finally”, concluded the Pope, “with the discretion of a mother and a teacher, and thanks to the open-hearted confidence with which you have been able to inspire your children, you will not fail to watch for and to discern the moment in which certain unspoken questions have occurred to their minds, and are troubling their senses. It will then be your duty to your daughters, the father’s duty to your sons, carefully and delicately to unveil the truth as far as it appears necessary; to give a prudent, true, and Christian answer to those questions, and set their minds at rest.

If imparted by the lips of Christian parents, at the proper time, in the proper measure, and with proper precautions, the revelation of the mysterious and marvellous laws of life will be received by them with reverence and gratitude, and will enlighten their minds with far less danger than if they learned them haphazard from some disturbing encounter, from secret conversations, from over-sophisticated companions, or from clandestine reading—the more dangerous and pernicious as secrecy inflames the imagination, and troubles the senses”.

Several things in that passage are well worthy of serious consideration.

Firstly, the Pope declares that it is the duty of parents to win the confidence of their children, so that the children will feel that they can go to their parents in any and every difficulty without fear of instant reproach.

Secondly, parents should not even leave it to the children to approach them on the subject of sex, marriage, and parenthood. The Holy Father says that they should notice when unspoken



questions occur to their minds, and trouble their senses; and that then it is their duty to explain the mysterious and marvellous laws of life, how God has given to men and women, within marriage, the wonderful privilege of co-operating with Him in the work of creation. The parents are to give a prudent, true, and Christian answer to the problems as to why God created the two sexes, the differences between them, how He intends them to unite in marriage, and by what actions they are enabled to have the children they desire.

Thirdly, it is to be noticed that, if the truth has to be explained by parents, they need not explain the full truth at once. There are precautions to be observed. The truth must be given in proper measure at the proper time; that is, as each child is ready for it. The knowledge must therefore be given gradually and individually.

Such then, is the duty. And if that duty is not fulfilled, the Pope declares that the knowledge will be obtained from bad reading or bad companions, with an inevitable legacy of temptation, and perhaps sin. Of course it is possible that a child won't get the information at all, but will be left in complete ignorance. That can lead to worse disasters at the hands of unscrupulous people, or at least to a good deal of unnecessary misery over quite natural experiences which are not understood and cause feelings of distress and guilt.

#### PARENTAL NEGLECT.

Unfortunately, most parents do not, and will not fulfil their duty in this matter. This is true of Catholics and of non-Catholics alike. Even doctors, and married women who have been trained as nurses, refuse, shirking what they regard as an embarrassing experience. The result is that most children either get their information from other and wrong sources, or are left a prey to ignorance, false shame, fear, scruples, or even to secret vice. And it will be a long time before the Pope's wishes that parents themselves should be fully instructed in their duty of teaching their children can be fulfilled.

What is to be done in the meantime? Some extra-parental instruction of the children is necessary. Can it be given in our schools?

Indirectly, something can be done, over and above teaching religion, esteem for the angelic virtue, devotion to Our Lady, and the duty of avoiding the occasions of sin.

But no specific lessons on the physiological facts of sex, or on the reproductive relations of the sexes, may be given collectively to school children, however delicate and general the treatment may be. All dir-

ect and specific instructions must be given privately and individually, or not at all. And, as a rule, it should not be given at all by school teachers. It is not their duty to give it; and children who ask or need such instruction should be referred to their parents normally. Only on rare occasions, with the knowledge of and at the request of parents, should others undertake to give private and individual instruction.

What teachers can do is to give indirect collective instruction by taking advantage of their history, literature, and religion classes, working into their treatment of those subjects an explanation of the origin, meaning, and utility of social conventions. They can impress upon their pupils the right attitude to be adopted towards the opposite sex. They can stress the dignity and importance of marriage, and the need of a good family life. And they can emphasise the danger and unworthiness of wrong conduct.

Beyond such indirect treatment in the class-room they cannot go; but must pin their hopes to the normal and traditional Catholic programme of sound religious instruction and character formation, high ideals of modesty and purity, devotion to Our Lady, and flight from occasions of sin and from all against which conscience protests.

L. RUMBLE, M.S.C.

---

The subject of which a summary treatment has been given above has been developed at greater length by Fr. J. Leycester King, S.J., in his recent study, "Sex Enlightenment and the Catholic", Bellarmine Series, 1944. To those desiring further knowledge of the matter, and access to relevant official documents, that book will prove most useful.

# Venom and Vinegar

## THE "SITIO" PSALM.

The above title, "Venom and Vinegar", is not chosen merely because of its impressive alliteration. Neither is it intended that it should sound like one of the sensational headings of modern newspapers. The words are taken from Psalm 68, which it is the purpose of this article to elucidate, and they point to the Psalm as a prophecy which had its sacred fulfilment in the Passion of Christ. We know that the programme of the Saviour's life included the "fulfilling of all that was written in the Law of Moses and in the Prophets and in the Psalms about Him". He told His disciples this after the resurrection, and to two of them, on the road to Emmaus, He set forth in one great synthesis, which made their hearts glow, the chief prophetic oracles that told of Him in all the sacred pages of the Old Testament, "beginning from Moses and all the Prophets".

The New Testament is our great guide to the significance of the Old. We shall be impressed, therefore, with the fact that there is no Old Testament piece of the same number of words—in fact, no single literary unit of the divine books of Israel which is so frequently quoted in the New Testament as Psalm 68. It even stands out as a sort of programme of Christ's public life from the beginning to the end. His first recorded action at Jerusalem realizes its description of Him, and, on the Cross, when about to declare His life-work finished, He fulfilled a last detail of this Psalm. Before we examine the text, let us see in detail the remarkable light which the Apostolic writings throw on this important prophetic picture of the Messias.

The credential letters of Christ, as the greatest of God's Ambassadors, were presented to Israel, when He was baptized by John. The visible presence of the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove told the Baptist that this was He Who should baptize in the Holy Spirit—that this was the One Who, coming after himself in time, ranked before him in dignity, because He was more ancient than any man born in time. The voice of the Father, after an "Audiant omnes" consisting of a visible cloud-break or opening of the heavens, verbally proclaimed: "This is My Beloved Son, in Whom I am well pleased". After this, the days of the Christ's public manifestation in Israel were beginning. But the Precursor's activity was to go on for a time. He was to whisper in the ears of the Bride that the Bridegroom had come; and the Bride



began to hear on the day that two of John's disciples followed the Lamb of God and found Him in an intimate colloquy that lasted from the tenth hour till the end of that day. The impression made upon them is best understood, when we think of the enthusiasm with which one of them announced to his predestined brother, Simon: "We have found the Messiah". The Baptist's part was to be "a voice" calling the Bride to the Bridegroom. As this work progressed, the son of Zachary and Elizabeth was to diminish and disappear. Disciples flocked from the school of John to the school of the Lamb of God. "*He was growing*", and the Precursor could only be glad. From the two who had asked that memorable question: "Rabbi, where art Thou staying?" the number of the future Princes of the kingdom had grown to five or six (if James the brother of John is already included), and before them Jesus worked His first public miracle at the wedding of Cana in Galilee. The inaugural manifestation of the Messiah in Jerusalem, the metropolis of Israel, was soon to come.

During the first Pasch of His public life, Jesus vindicated the sanctity of His Father's house at Jerusalem with an ardour that made His disciples think of a verse in one of their great national hymns. That hymn was precisely Psalm 68. It is better let St. John tell us how on that occasion, "His disciples remembered that it was written: The zeal of Thy house is consuming Me" (Jn. 2: 17—Ps. 68: 10).

Jewish hostility against their Messiah began that day, I mean, the official hostility of Israel, in the face of which Jesus had to carry out His mission. He did not come into the world to please men; He did not come into the world to please Himself; He came to do the will of His Father. Those who were really enemies of God, cultivating some form of selfishness, personal or national, would automatically be enemies of the Christ of God. Hence our Lord's life was the life of one under adverse criticism, contempt, insult, reproach or opprobrium. When St. Paul points this out to the Romans (15: 3), in order to cure selfish belittlement of weaker brethren by the stronger members of the community, he refers to Psalm 68: 10. "Christ", he says, "did not please Himself; but, as it is written: The hostile criticisms of those who criticize Thee, [o God], have fallen on Me". Together with the verse, "*Zelus domus tuee etc.*", with which it forms a distich, this citation sums up the image of the faithful servant of God, whose will is his Lord's, and whose opponents and critics are the opponents and critics of the ways of God.

But it is not merely the Beloved Disciple or St. Paul that quoted this Psalm and applied it to Christ. The Divine Master Himself, at the last supper, told His disciples to expect the same treatment from the world which the world had given Him. "They have seen Me" He said, "and they have fixedly hated Me, both Me and My Father. But this happened for the fulfilment of the word which is written in their Law, that is to say, 'they hated me without cause'". (Ps. 68: 5). These words occur in identical participial form in Pss. 34: 19 and 68: 5, but we can feel sure that it is from the greater Messianic Psalm 68 that our Lord adapts them and applies them to Himself.

But our Psalm was to receive its greatest consecration on Good Friday—The Psalmist, in vividly describing the maltreatment, to which he was subjected, uses language which, at first sight, seems metaphor, for the context is one of insult and unconsolated affliction: "Hostile abuse has broken my heart—I could stand it no longer—I waited for one with compassion—but there was none—for consolers, but found them not—they put in my food the venom of bitters—and in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink". (68: 21, 22). As we shall see, the bitter juice of some particular venomous plant is meant, and the sour wine which we call vinegar. As the context seems to be one of moral ill-usage, one could easily be led to interpret the "poisoned dish" and the "bitter cup" as metaphors for general bad treatment. The New Testament, however, rectifies such an impression. The words were fulfilled to the letter in Him who is really the Psalmist of this Psalm. The Septuagint translated the "bitter venom" with the word *Cholé*, meaning "gall". Now Christ our Lord was offered a narcotic drink before crucifixion. St. Mark describes it almost like an apothecary, as "myrrhated wine", myrrh being the bitter narcotic poison in the mixture destined to act as a sort of anaesthetic. St. Mark says that our Lord did not take it (15:23). St. Matthew describes the same event, but calls the liquor "wine mixed with gall". This evangelist, though he does not expressly cite, undoubtedly had our Psalm in mind. He notes that Christ tasted the bitterness, but did not drink the narcotic. Strange to say, St. Luke, physician though he was, says nothing about this potion.

Furthermore, a drink of sour wine administered to the Saviour on the cross is mentioned by Matthew, Mark and John. All three likewise tell that the liquid was brought to the lips of the Sufferer by means of a soaked sponge set on a reed. St. John is the only one of the three to

bring the fact into relation with Old Testament prophecy. "After this", he writes, (namely, after the commendation of His mother to St. John), Jesus knowing that all things were brought to completion, in order that the Scripture might be completely fulfilled, said: *I thirst*. A vessel was at hand full of sour wine. Therefore, putting a sponge full of the sour wine on hyssop, they brought it to His mouth. When, therefore, He took the sour wine, Jesus said: "It is finished [that is to say, the work of redemption set forth in the prophecies of Scripture is completely fulfilled], and bowing His head He gave up His spirit".

Certainly Jesus suffered physical thirst—physical thirst in the most excruciating degree—but it was not in view of its alleviation that He said: "I thirst". He knew well that within perhaps less than a minute He would make the free and sovereign act of surrendering His soul. He really only satisfied the thirst of His life, which was one with that hunger of which He spoke beside the well of Sychar: "My food is to do the will of Him Who sent Me, to *finish* His work". Now there are only two scriptures of the Old Testament which the Saviour can have had in mind, namely, Psalm 21: 16, which is descriptive of the Divine Victim's thirst only, and Psalm 68: 22, which adds the circumstance of the offering of sour wine. We, therefore, lawfully conclude that this is the verse of the oracles of His Messianic mission that Jesus consecrates and fulfils by pronouncing His fifth word: "Sitio". It is very profitable for us to try habitually to recite Psalm 68 as a "Sitio-Psalm".

We have not come to the end of New Testament citation yet. There is no need to insist again that our Psalm is a tremendous picture of Israel's hostility to Israel's Messias. That hostility was the greatest national crime that the world has known. But in the indictment of Israel's perfidy, one sinister figure stands out as the blackest criminal of all. He was the apostate Apostle, Judas Iscariot. And St. Peter found Judas Iscariot in Psalm 68. These are his words in the Upper Room at Jerusalem, when he introduces the matter of choosing a faithful Apostle to take the place of the apostate (Acts 1: 16-20): "Brethren, the scripture had to be fulfilled, that is to say, the scripture which the Holy Spirit prophetically uttered through the mouth of David concerning Judas. He became the leader of those who arrested Jesus; he was numbered amongst us; and he received the lot of this [same] ministry. He was the one who indeed took possession of a field out of the salary of iniquity, and he fell headforemost and burst



in the middle, and all his entrails gushed forth. And it became known to all the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and in consequence that field has been called in their own language *Haqeldama*, which means field of Blood. For it is written in the Book of Psalms: 'Let his dwelling become a wilderness, and let there be no one to live in it' ". The citation is the 26th verse of our Psalm put in the singular number, for St. Peter realized that the prophetic imprecation, which the Psalm voiced against all the enemies of Christ, belonged especially to Judas Iscariot the traitor.

The imprecations of our Psalm fell on the whole blind mass of apostate Israel. We must not, it is true, allow ourselves to forget St. Paul's prophecy about the splendid final future of the Jewish nation, but in the present it is still under the curse of the crucifixion. The Jews are tragically blinded. Religiously, God has given them a spirit of stupidity, eyes not to see and ears not to hear, till the present day. It is St. Paul that says this of them and he adds (Rom. 11: 9, 10): "David says: Let their table become a snare and a trap and a stumbling-block and a retribution to them; let their eyes be darkened so as not to see; and bend down their backs for ever' ". These are verses 23 and 24 of Psalm 68, cited by the Apostle from the Greek Septuagint with some slight freedoms of addition and modification.

This New Testament introduction to an Old Testament Psalm may seem unduly long, but it is worth while. The Old Testament and the New stand together, as promise and fulfilment, prediction and realization. It should, therefore, be our constant concern to seek and find the New latent in the Old, and edify our faith and piety by discovering the Old patent in the New. "*Novum in veteri latet, vetus in novo patet*".

\*

\*

\*

\*

From what has been said the Messianic character of the Psalm will be evident. The Fathers of the Church and Catholic exegetes throughout the centuries have proclaimed with one voice that our Psalm tells of the sufferings of Christ. As to whether it is typically Messianic or directly Messianic there is not the same unanimity. Ancient interpretation stands for direct Messianity. Theodoret, followed by Euthymius, seems to be the only notable exception. The majority of post-Tridentine expositors are of the same mind, and refer to Eusebius, Athanasius, Hilary, Jerome, Augustine. Outstanding examples are Genebrardus, Jansenius, Agellius, Bellarmine, and, of these, Bellarmine remarks that St. Augustine constantly reproves those who expound

this Psalm otherwise than the Apostles expounded it. Many moderns have, however, inclined to the typical sense on account of the Psalmists's apparent admission that he is a sinner (v. 6). But as St. Augustine pointed out, he does not say that he has *committed* sins, but that God knows what sins he has, namely, the sins of the world which he came to take away. "Delicta nulla Christus habuit; fuit delictorum susceptor non commissor". All things considered, direct Messianism seems to be the better opinion, although the other is quite orthodox and exegetically defensible.

That the Psalm had David as its author is the assertion not only of the title, but also of the two Princes of the Apostles (Acts 2: 16, Rom. 11: 8). The arguments against this attribution have no force. The Psalm sounds Jeremian, it is said, and there seems to be a reference to that Prophet's imprisonment in a cistern (16). But the cistern into which Jeremias was thrown (38: 6 ff) was without water, whereas all the Psalmist's metaphors are of "water drowning" or of "quagmire swallowing". Some affinities of language between our Psalmist and the Prophet of Anathoth are unmistakable, but since Jeremias was the greatest Old Testament type of the suffering Messiah, it is only to be expected that he assimilated the language of such Psalms as 30 and 68.

The last four verses (34-37) express the hope of Babylonian exiles, but there is no difficulty in supposing that these verses were added by some inspired poet to an old Davidic poem. In the sixth response given by the Biblical Commission on the Psalms (May 1, 1910) the admission of such additions is conceded. Liturgical usage made them almost inevitable. The last two verses of the *Miserere* are an instance of this kind of addition, which no one will be disposed to deny, and the four final verses of the present text of our present Psalm 68 are strikingly similar to them in the general theme, though they are still closer in thought to Psalm 101, with echoes of such triumphal songs as Psalms 67, 95, 148.

Coming to the text of the Psalm, let us first lay hold of its general idea and division. It is the prayer of a man whose afflictions are overwhelming, but they are not the afflictions of illness. The Psalmist's trouble is the making of hostile persecutors bent on ostracizing him and destroying him. They attribute faults to him of which he is entirely innocent; in fact, there is only one reason for his persecution, and that is that he is devotedly faithful to God. God is asked to uphold him and bring him through the struggle, not only on account of his

innocence, but also because he is the leader of those who are seeking their Lord. No one but God can help him, for the enemy federation is so strong and so determined in its opposition, that human support and sympathy are timid and disappointingly absent. As for the Psalmist's enemies, they are hardened in malice, and his prayer is not *for* them but *against* them, taking the form of imprecations which are based on the retaliative retribution recognised in the Old Testament. No such imprecations are found in the recorded prayers of Christ, for He came not to judge the world but to save it. However, He once cursed a barren fig-tree, to show how justice was to fall on a nation of showy leafage and no spiritual fruitage; and in so far as these imprecations are prophetic, they represent Christ's adherence to the just will of His Father, which he announced to His enemies in a very outright way, when He told them that they "would die in their sins". (Jn. 8: 23, 24). We may experience some difficulty in reconciling these imprecations with the Christian spirit, which forbids us to call down fire on the unhospitable villages of Samaria; nevertheless, as members of the Church Militant, we definitely pray against those who are hostile to God, and there should be no half-heartedness in our petition that God may humble the enemies of His holy Church—ut inimicos sanctae Ecclesiae humiliare dignetur. We may add, with a certain amount of theological trepidation at the severity of the assertion, that we occasionally know of sinister individuals in this world who are so obviously instruments of Satan or limbs of the devil, that we feel no urge from the Holy Spirit to expressly include them in our prayers. It was the disciple of charity, one of the two "sons of thunder", who were rebuked for their proposal: "Let us say that fire should come down from heaven and consume them"—it was John the Beloved who wrote: "If any one sees his brother sinning a sin not unto death, he shall ask, and he shall give him life—that is, to those not sinning unto death. There is sin unto death, and it is not about that I say one should ask" (I Jn. 5: 16). The distinction is a fearful one, and we must not be presumptuous in applying it. We do not know infallibly, as Christ our Lord did, that any single individual who lives in this world with us is a confirmed devil, but we do know in general that there are agents of Satan amongst our contemporaries against whom, in the Holy Ghost, we may direct all the severe justice of the imprecations of Psalm 68, or even the longer but really not more terrible series of Psalm 108. The recital of these prayers should also remind ourselves that it is "terrible to fall into the



hands of the living God" (Heb. 10: 31). It is true that the imprecations, especially those of Psalm 108, tend to fix on a single individual, who is the chief leader of a bad movement, but we, who do not possess prophetic inspiration, cannot always imitate this tendency. It was believed that the sudden death of the heresiarch Arius was due to the prayers of Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria, and of James, Bishop of Nisibis, but if these two holy Bishops—both saints—prayed a personal prayer of imprecation against the enemy of the Holy Trinity, we know that Alexander had been warned by his predecessor, St. Peter, on the strength of a vision, never to withdraw the excommunication of Arius "because he knew him to be dead before God". This is an exceptional case, but generally speaking, although we know, for instance, that a communistic atheistic state must be a fortress of Satan, we cannot say for certain that the head of that State is an irredeemable reprobate. The knowledge of these things belongs to God. We must remember St. Augustine's words: "*Ipsorum tantum desperanda est correctio, contra quos habemus occultam luctam... principes, et potestates, et rectores mundi, tenebrarum harum*". Still, it is certain that God hardens evil men to-day, as he hardened Pharaoh long ago, and it is on human agents of Satan—whoever they be—rather than on Satan himself that the terrible weight of Christ's prayer and ours will fall, when we say: "Let them be blotted out of the book of the living, and not be written with the just" (28). Prayer is the instrument of the severities of divine justice, as well as of the superabundant graces of divine mercy.

This is a long, but not a useless degression, for imprecation is frequent in our Psalter, and causes difficulty to not a few who use this militant prayer book. No one can love what is good without hating evil intensely, and hatred creates fiercely destructive wishes. However, our Psalm ends in the peace of God, in promises of thanksgiving, and in the encouragement of humble afflicted souls who are seeking God. This promise lapses into the exilic addition already mentioned.

To sum up the theme and its division, we need only move the five fingers of one hand, for the main strophes (which are susceptible of division into sub-units) are five, in which: 1) the Psalmist tells his overwhelming afflictions (2-5); 2) finds their cause in his zeal for God's service (6-13); 3) earnestly prays to be delivered (14-22); 4) calls down God's justice on his persecutors (23-29); 5) promises praise and thanksgiving (30-33), to which is appended the application to the exiles of Babylon, who await the restoration of Jerusalem and the cities of Juda (34-37).

The title of our Psalm informs us that it was destined for the collection of the Prefect or Master of the Choir, and that it is a poem of the royal Psalmist, David. Between these two indications stand the words: "On Lilies". "*Shōshannim* or Lilies" is the name of a well-known air, to which the Psalm was to be sung. It is also the air indicated for Psalm 45 (the great Royal Wedding Song), while Psalms 59 and 79 (songs of defeat to be retrieved) were sung to an air of a similar name, "the Lily of the Law". It is somewhat strange that the same tune should be indicated for the enthusiastic epithalamium composed by a Levitical poet of the clan of Core and this plaintive Psalm of David. They are both Messianic poems, but they differ widely in tone. However, there is an élan in the agitated prayer of our Psalmist, which may not be so very remote from the quick movement of the Qorachic song, a song which begins in the effervescence of almost uncontrollable inspiration. In the Septuagint version the "Susans" (pluralised also in 59 and 70) are read as a relative *she* + *shōnim*, giving the meaning "those who shall be changed". This Alexandrian mistake gave the Fathers material for beautiful remarks on the appropriateness of these Psalms for those who were destined to be changed into true children of God. But perhaps the tune of "Lilies", though we do not know what it was like, charms us as much as that of "the great change".

\*

\*

\*

\* \*

In the first strophe of the Psalm (2-5), the poet does three things. He voices, in "sinking" metaphors, the greatness of his distress (2, 3); he describes his desperate cry for help and its apparent hopelessness (4); then, without metaphor, he tells of the multitude, the injustice, the strength of his enemies, and asks a proverbial question (5).

A. 2-5: Save me, O God,  
           for the waters have come to my neck.  
 I am sunk in a deep morass ,  
           with nowhere to set my foot.  
 I have come into depths of water,  
           overwhelmed by the waves.  
 I am wearied out with shouting,  
           my throat is dried to hoarseness.  
 My eyes are losing their sight,  
           from looking out for my God.

More numerous are they than the hairs of my head  
 who hate me undeserving.  
 Stronger than my bodily frame  
 are those who unjustly oppose me.  
 Must I pay back what I did not rob?

Translation of this simple and powerful Hebrew poetry is a very difficult matter. One seems to lose least of the Hebrew truth in an ancient language—Greek or Latin. The images, however, are unmistakable. Such ideas as floods of affliction, a sea of troubles, bogging in misfortune are familiar to us. The persecuted Psalmist is like a drowning man, “for the waters have come to his soul”. The last term “soul”, found in all the ancient versions, and all (except very recent) modern versions, is now generally replaced (even in the new Roman Psalter) by “neck”. This word suits the context here, for a non-swimmer up to his neck in rising water is near drowning. In general, however, passages like Jeremias, 4: 10, 18; Jonas 2. 6 might raise very reasonable doubts as to whether the Hebrew *nephesh* ever means “neck”, as *napishtu* does in Assyrian. We easily understand that a man may be “up to his neck” not only “in debt” but in any overwhelming misfortune. The *flooding* metaphor is reinforced by a *quagmire* picture. Not only beside Bahrat el-Huleh, but in many parts of Palestine there were fearful liquid marshes, “treacherous to the last degree”. To sink in one of these, without foothold, was a desperate plight. The third overpowering force mentioned is the hostile strength of moving water, whether it be the onslaught of waves or of a fierce, racing torrent. We have adopted the translation “waves” as sufficient equivalent of the Hebrew *shibboleth* (the Ephraimite test-word), which not only means an “ear of corn” but also “a stream”. Here it is a stream threatening death, an invading column of water.

To call repeatedly for help in extreme peril and to receive no response is calculated to sap the strength of hope. But our greatest appeal to the Omnipotent is to tell Him that things are utterly hopeless. The Psalmist represents himself as exhausted by the labour of his cries for help, which have made his throat dry and inflamed—a condition translated as “hoarseness” in the Greek and Latin Psalters. His eyes are strained and dim from looking to God for assistance, which is delayed.

Undeserved hatred and unjust hostility are his lot; and he is insistent on the numbers and strength of his enemies. The parallelism



in verse 5 commends the reading supposed by the Syriac translation, namely, "bones" or "bodily frame", following an elative (comparative) *min*, rather than a participle meaning "my destroyers". The final question of this strophe is a proverb in which innocence makes its protest: "Shall I be forced to give back what I have not taken?" St. Thomas Aquinas uses the text repeatedly of the work of the Redeemer Who, though innocent, paid the price of the robbery or refusal of allegiance implicated in the guilt of sin. This whole verse (a tristich) receives a special enhancement and sacredness from the citation of the one hemistich: "Odio habuerunt me gratis" by our Lord.

\* \* \* \*

In the second strophe (6-13) the Psalmist again does three things. He appeals to God's knowledge in regard to the crimes of which he is accused (6); he asks for the victory for himself on behalf of those who hope in God and seek Him (v. 7); he asserts emphatically that his fidelity to God and zeal for His cause is the real explanation of the ostracism and derision which have fallen upon him (8-13).

B. 6-13: O God, Thou knowest my foolishness,  
                     and my sins are not hidden from Thee.  
 Let not shame come because of me to those who hope in  
                     Thee,  
                     o Lord God of armies.  
 Let not dishonour fall because of me  
                     on those who are seeking Thee, o God of Israel.  
 Indeed it is for Thy sake I bear reproach,  
                     ignominy covers my face.  
 I am become an outsider to my brethren,  
                     and an alien to the sons of my mother.  
 For the zeal of Thy house has consumed me,  
                     and the abuse of those abusing Thee has fallen on me.  
 I afflicted my soul with fasting,  
                     and it was turned to ignominy for me.  
 I clothed myself in sackcloth,  
                     and I became a laughing stock to them.  
 They talk of me—those who sit at the gate,  
                     and they make cant of me—those who drink strong  
                     drink.

The whole context of the Psalm really seems to exclude a confession of personal guilt. It is not sufficient to say that the Psalmist admits personal sins, but not those of which his enemies accuse him. Of verse 6 there are two possible explanations which suit the context. Either the appeal to the Omniscient is to prove the non-existence of the sins laid to his charge, or it is to have God's attestation that the sins which he carries are not his own. The latter is the opinion made classic by the words of St. Augustine quoted earlier in this article; the former has been proposed recently by *Calès*, who takes it from a sixteenth century commentator, *Flaminius*. It is a tempting interpretation, but difficult of acceptance, when we reduce it to its naked form: Thou knowest my foolishness (not to be existent), and my (pretended) guilt is not hidden from thee.

Our comment on the other verses can be brief. If Christ is not sinless and accepted by God, our hope in God and our quest for Him are vain and destined to certain disappointment. In considering Christ's opprobrium and the isolation which His fidelity occasioned, we can call to mind not only the hostility of scribes and Pharisees and Sadducees, but also such facts as the efforts of His relatives to keep Him in restraint (Mark 3: 21), and the incomprehension of His spiritual mission by His own brethren or cousins (Jn. 7: 5). What our Psalmist (Christ) says of His fasting as a cause of opprobrium is not clearly found in the Gospel, in which rather we see Him blamed for not keeping the special Pharisee fasts; but the life of the Saviour though common had undoubtedly such measure of external austerity, as would be a theme of amusement for city-gate gossipers and matter for the comic songs of those that frequented taverns. What *Isaias* says of the drunkards of Ephraim and their "*Sav lāsav*" "*qav lāqav*" cant against the Prophet is a good illustration of what the Psalmist means. (Is. XXVIII).

\*

\*

\*

\*

The prayer (14-22) is exceedingly touching. It first appeals to the goodness and faithfulness of God, Who knows His times of grace (14); secondly, it recalls the Psalmist's need in terms nearly identical to the opening metaphors of the first strophe (15, 16); thirdly, appeal is renewed in most pressing terms to the God of benignity and mercy and justice (17-19); fourthly, description is resumed in language which is a beautiful prophetic revelation of the Heart of Jesus illtreated and unconsolated (20-22).

C. 14-22: As for me—my prayer is to Thee o Lord,  
in the time of grace, O God.  
Through Thy great mercy graciously hear me,  
through Thy saving help, which is faithful.  
Rescue me from the mud lest I be submerged,  
let me be rescued from my enemies,  
and from the depths of the waters.  
Let not the waves of water drown me,  
and let not the depths swallow me up,  
and let not the well close its mouth on me.  
Graciously hear me, o Lord, for Thy grace is benign,  
through Thy great tender mercy look down on me.  
And hide not Thy face from Thy servant;  
in my trouble be quick to hear me.  
Come near to my soul, redeem it;  
on account of my enemies deliver it.  
Thou knowest my ignominy and shame and confusion;  
before Thee are all who oppose me.  
Ignominy has broken my heart, and I am wretched,  
and I waited for one having compassion—but there  
was none,  
and for consolers, but found none.  
And they gave as my food, a bitter venom,  
and in my thirst vinegar to drink.

Every effort in our power has been made to give the Hebrew words their full meaning. There are, however, two words which have to be left in a certain degree of indetermination. "I am wretched" represents a verb *nūsh* of uncertain meaning. "I am heavy" is often given as an English rendering. *Nūsh* occurs nowhere else in the Bible, but there is a cognate verb 'ānash which means to be seriously and (most often) incurably ill. It was apparently a noun derived from this verb which the Alexandrian translator read and rendered *talaipōria*, i.e., misery. The New Roman Psalter has "defeci"; others translate: "I cannot stand it". In the text, we have chosen: "I am wretched" as being nearest to the suggestion furnished by the venerable old Septuagint. This is a passage in which we almost regret to lose the considerably different version of the Gallican Psalter, which follows a common manuscript text of the Septuagint (differing however only in one small point from the critical edition of Rahlfs):



"Improperium expectavit cor meum et miseriam—et sustinui qui simul contristaretur, et non fuit—et qui consolaretur et non inveni". (See the Offertory Antiphon of the Mass of Sacred Heart).

Another word for which semantic specification is impossible occurs at the head of this article, rendered by the generic term, "venom". The Hebrew word is *rô'sh*, which means some plant having a poisonous and very bitter juice. *Rô'sh* first occurs as the name of a "poisonful" plant in Deut. 29: 18, used metaphorically however of socially poisonous and bitter persons and borrowed by St. Paul in *Hebrews* 12: 15. In the great Canticle of Moses (Deut. 32: 33) and in Job 20: 16 the venom or poison of asps is called by this name. *Rô'sh* is certainly a poisonous plant (hemlock?) in Osee 10: 4, and its venomous character may also be the dominant notion in Amos 6: 12. In all other passages (this Psalm and four or five Jeremian places) the bitterness of the venom seems to be in the forefront. In Lamentations 3: 19, for instance, the *la'ânâh* (which is the intensely bitter *absinth* or *wormwood*) is coupled with *rô'sh*. Therefore, the names for the bitter hepatic product: *cholê*, *fel*, or *gall* furnish substantially good translations of this bitter venom which can no longer be specifically identified. We must not forget, however, that the human "venom" called jealousy and hatred was the source of all the bitterness which Christ tasted in His bitter Passion.

\*

\*.

\*

\*

The imprecations are closely connected with the thought of the bitter food and drink. They begin with the wish that the enemies' table may become an instrument of ruin to them. Downfall and misfortune by tripping over, by loss of sight, by weakening of bodily strength (23, 24) lead on to the wrath of God striking them in their homes and families (25, 26). The severity of retaliative vengeance sought in the following verses is terrific. Having added blow to blow and wound to wound in their persecution of the Psalmist, may they add sin to sin, till their hardening becomes irremissible and they are cut off from the society of the just (27-29).

D. 23-29: May their table in front of them be a snare,  
and to [their] friends a trap.

May their eyes be darkened and sightless,  
and make their hips shaky for ever.

Pour out on them Thy indignation,  
and let the fire of Thy wrath overtake them.

Let their camp become a wilderness,  
 and let their tents have no dwellers.  
 For, whom Thou didst strike, they persecuted,  
 and to the pain of Thy wounded one they added.  
 Make them add guilt to their guilt,  
 and let them not come to Thy justice.  
 Let them be blotted out of the book of the living,  
 and with the just let them not be written.

Comment would only blunt the force of these strong lines. One textual remark is necessary, and one exegetical note. The phrase: "To the pain of Thy wounded one they added" supposes two slight emendations of the Masoretic text adopted by the Roman translators. The emendation which gives: "Thy wounded one" rests on the authority of a manuscript and is commended by the individual character of the Psalm. The other change giving: "Thy added" is "graphically" possible, and gives an excellent sense.

As far as language goes, "the book of the living" might be translated "book of life", but the authority of the Septuagint has been followed. The words of this imprecation are very fearful, but do not necessarily include the eternal damnation of the accursed ones. Those who died in the Noachic flood were "blotted out of the book of the living", but we know from St. Peter (I Petr. 3: 19, 20) that some of them were saved from eternal death.

\* \* \* \*

The promise of thanksgiving and grateful praise begins with a short prayer (30). As in Psalm 49, the praise of a grateful heart is regarded as more pleasing to God than animal victims (31, 32), and as in Psalm 33 and often elsewhere others are invited to join in the chorus of thanksgiving and of joy in the Lord (33).

E. 30-33: I, indeed, am afflicted and suffering;  
 let Thy help, o God, protect me.  
 I will praise the name of God with song,  
 and celebrate Him with thanksgiving.  
 This shall please God more than any bull,  
 more than a young bull growing horns and hoofs.  
 See, ye lowly ones, and be glad,  
 and may your heart live, ye seekers of God.

The second plural imperative of the Syriac Peshitta in the last distich tends to rally the preferences of textual critics, especially as

the distich ends in the wish: "May your heart live". This beautiful wish only occurs twice in the Psalter, and it is remarkable that the two instances should be from the two great Passion Psalms 21 and 68.

\*

\*

\*

~

\*

The exilian appendix tacks itself on very naturally. It was due, of course, to a divinely inspired poet, for it is canonical Scripture. It tells of the goodness of God to the poor and the prisoner (34); it calls heaven and earth and sea (*terra, pontus, sidera*) to praise Him (35); and it expresses the hope that God will restore Sion, and build up the cities of Juda for lovers of His Name to dwell in them (36, 37).

34-37: For the Lord listens to the poor,  
                   and His prisoners He does not despise.  
 Let the heavens and the earth praise Him,  
                   the seas and whatever things move in them.  
 For God will save Sion,  
                   and build up the cities of Juda:  
                   and they shall return there and possess it;  
 And the seed of His servants shall inherit it;  
                   and those who love His name shall settle in it.

It would be interesting to study all the echoes, great and little, of the sacred poems of God's people, which this addition contains. Some indication has been given in the introduction, but without any pretention to exhaustiveness. Pious Israelites lived on the Psalms, and no one shows that better than the poetess of the "Magnificat", who, like the exile of Babylon, could only think in reminiscences of the poetry of Israel. The Syrians were right, when they called the Psalter "the Heart of God".

WILLIAM LEONARD.



# Moral Theology & Canon Law

## PROBLEMS ON BETTING AND RACING.

Dear Rev. Sir,

Father Joachim seeks some advice on betting and racing:—

1. He employs an agent to whom he writes or telegraphs instructions to bet for him at the race meetings. From the agent he receives a half-yearly account of his transactions. In the latest he finds that a stake he had telegraphed for £5 was changed to £15 and that he has won £100 more than he would have done without this mistake. He takes this as his good fortune, for he would have lost £15 on his account if the horse had not won. Can he keep this £100?
2. There is a Suspension in this Diocese for the Clergy attending race meetings. Generally it is respected without question, but Fr. Joachim cannot obtain any declaration of what is implied by attendance—one can be present in the stand, in the enclosure, outside the enclosure, outside the fence, etc. He discreetly requests a confrere to seek a definition from the Bishop, who merely answers: "The Priests know very well what the prohibition is". Therefore, Fr. Joachim concludes: "*Lex dubia, lex nulla*", and joins the crowd at the racecourse for the Spring Meeting. Does he escape the Censure?

### REPLY.

1. An Agent is duly authorised to act for his Principal within the terms of his commission. The Principal is responsible for any losses due to genuine mistakes of his Agent, i.e., to mistakes not attributable to lack of reasonable proficiency of which the Principal was not aware, or to carelessness. It appears that Fr. Joachim is satisfied with his Agent and prepared to stand by his mistakes, for he was resigned to put up with the loss of £15 had his fancy not won the race. Likewise, he reaps the advantage of a mistake in the other direction and can well smile at his good fortune in receiving £100 he did not expect. Whether he should rejoice or do penance for the violation of decree n. 54 of the Plenary Council which forbids betting with book-makers "*aut per se aut per alios*", is a question we have not been asked.

2. It seems quite clear that Fr. Joachim incurred the suspension by attending the Spring Meeting. The first rule of interpretation of a Law is that it is to be understood according to the proper meaning

of the words as they are in the text and in the context. That the Bishop meant this particular Law to be understood in its obvious sense appears from his remark that the Priests knew very well what the Law is; and the general observance of the Law shows that its interpretation does not present any great difficulty. If a person, who is one of the crowd at the racecourse for the Meeting, does not thereby "attend the races", words have lost their meaning. It would be just as reasonable to say that a person who heard a description of the Races over the air would attend the Races. There will often be cases which are doubtfully covered by the Law, and to these and these only does the dictum apply: *Lex dubia, lex nulla*. An instance in point is watching the Races from a height some distance away. But there are definitely cases where the operation of the Law is certain, and Fr. Joachim's forming one of the crowd at the Spring Meeting was one of them on this occasion. The only escape for Fr. Joachim that we can see is invincible ignorance, and we very much doubt whether a man who can weave such ingenious arguments is as ignorant as he would have people believe.

\*

\*

\*

\*

#### VIATICUM ADMINISTERED BY LAY PERSONS.

Dear Rev. Sir,

It is said in some text books of Moral Theology that in case of necessity every lay person is allowed to bring Holy Communion (*Viaticum*) to a dying man, even if there is danger of scandal.

1. Is this justifiable?
2. Is special permission of the Ordinary required for it?
3. What ritus would be observed by Brothers or Sisters of Religious Societies?

#### REPLY.

It is commonly held by the more recent Theologians that when no Priest or Deacon is available, Holy Communion (*Viaticum*) may be administered by a lay person. The older Theologians held that such a procedure was not lawful, because the actual reception of the Eucharist was not necessary for salvation, and further, the custom of the Universal Church was otherwise. The opinion which holds for the lawfulness of the administration of the *Viaticum* by a lay person seems to us to be most probable.

The Minister of a Sacrament acts in the name of Christ and is the instrumental cause of the grace which is received. In order validly to administer any Sacrament, a person must have received from Christ

the power and authority to be His instrument and to act in His name. We know from the teaching of the Church, as expressed e.g. in the Decree *Pro Armenis* of the Council of Florence that the Sacraments of Confirmation, Penance, Extreme Unction, Holy Orders and the Consecration of the Eucharist require that the Minister be constituted as such by sacerdotal Ordination (or Episcopal Consecration). No one whether lay or cleric, not in the Order of Priesthood, can administer these Sacraments, in any circumstances, even of the most extreme necessity; and Major Orders may be conferred only by a Bishop.

With regard to the Sacraments of Baptism and Matrimony, and the distribution of the Eucharist, Christ has disposed differently, and to others, not in the Priesthood, has been given the power to act as His ministers. Matrimony is the contract raised to the dignity of a Sacrament, and so the parties who make the contract are also the Ministers of the Sacrament. These parties are baptised lay folk—in the Western Church they must be so—and, incidentally, one of them is a woman who administers the sacrament to the man. The Sacrament of Baptism may be administered solemnly by a Deacon with due authorisation, and because of its absolute necessity, our Lord has constituted every person capable of a human act His minister for this Sacrament; so that even those who detest Christ and His Church could baptise validly at all times, and lawfully in cases of necessity, provided they had the intention of doing what the Church does. Likewise, to distribute the Eucharist does not require the power of the Priesthood; the Deacon from his Ordination receives this power, though he is forbidden to use it except in certain circumstances. That the Eucharist may be distributed validly by any person at all follows from the fact that it is taken as food, and the nutritive value of food is something inherent in itself and not dependent on the person who actually serves it. So from the point of view of validity, there is no difficulty in having the Blessed Eucharist distributed by other than a consecrated minister. The question, however, concerns the lawful administration of Holy Communion.

Usually it is not lawful for any person but a Priest to distribute Holy Communion, for he is the ordinary minister of the Eucharist. As St. Thomas teaches (S.T. p. 3, q. 83, a. 3.), at the Last Supper, it was Christ who consecrated and Christ who administered to His Apostles the consecrated elements, so also the Priest consecrates and he should distribute Holy Communion. Likewise, the Priest is con-



stituted a Mediator, who not only offers gifts to God, but brings down graces and blessings to men. Further, the idea of reverence for the Blessed Eucharist seems to demand that It should be touched only by a hand that has been consecrated. As the Angelic Doctor has written in the Hymn, "Sacris Solemnis".

Sic sacrificium istud instituit  
Cujus officium committi voluit  
Solis presbyteris, quibus sic congruit,  
Ut sumant et dent ceteris.

These reasons when examined are only *rationes convenientiae*, and do not carry weight in the case of the Deacon who has been officially appointed as the minister of the Eucharist with due dependence, it is true, on the Priest.

There is a principle concerning the administration of the Sacraments which we may invoke: What is valid always, though not always lawful, is lawful in case of necessity. This principle is but an application of the common one: *Sacramenta propter homines*. In cases of necessity (i.e., in danger of death, when no Priest or Deacon can be had) any person may lawfully baptise; in case of like necessity, any person may administer the Blessed Eucharist.

But here we meet the objection of the older authors: Baptism is necessary for salvation; the Eucharist is not: in fact a person must be in the state of grace, and so have the essential requisite for heaven, before he can worthily receive the Eucharist. To this we answer that both Baptism and the Eucharist are necessary for a dying man who has not received them—Baptism *necessitate medii*, and the Eucharist *necessitate praecepti*. When, therefore, a person in danger of death and capable of receiving the Holy Viaticum, and there is no authorised minister available (a Priest or Deacon), we have a conflict of laws. On the one hand we have the divine precept of receiving Holy Communion in danger of death. The existence of this precept is not questioned, for it follows that, if Our Lord enjoined the eating of His Flesh and the drinking of His Blood as a requisite for eternal life, He surely meant that we should have It at the precise time when our eternal life is in greatest jeopardy. On the other hand, we have the universal custom of the Church, enshrined in her legislation, that the ordinary minister of the Eucharist is a Priest and the extraordinary minister a Deacon, and no mention of any other: this would amount to an Ecclesiastical Law against the administration of Communion by a lay person. Further, there is the natural law of avoiding scandal, and

also the natural law of treating the Sacred Species with due reverence. In this conflict of laws, which should prevail? With regard to the Ecclesiastical Law, there is no doubt that it should yield to the Law of a higher Legislator, Christ Himself. But it may be questioned if there is a prohibition of the Church against the administration of Holy Communion in the circumstances we contemplate. History is witness of different customs in this matter; and it is reasonably to be supposed that the Church would not deprive her children of the graces of the Eucharist or prevent them from fulfilling the precept of her Divine Founder. Scandal can be avoided if it is explained to those concerned that in such circumstances, it is not forbidden for a lay person to handle the Blessed Sacrament and give Holy Communion. It would, perhaps, be more accurate to speak of admiration rather than scandal; or if it be scandal, it is of the variety known as *pusillorum*, and one would not be obliged to omit the fulfilment of a precept to avoid it. As for the motive of reverence, it would be strange if our reverence for the Sacraments were to go to such lengths that it would prevent those properly disposed from receiving them.

In short, it seems that the divine precept of receiving the Viaticum and the inestimable advantages of the graces conferred in this Sacrament far outweigh in importance any of the considerations that can be adduced against the lawfulness of allowing a lay person to bring Holy Communion to a dying man, who is able to receive It. Especially is this seen to be true when we consider that in the absence of the Priest, the person in danger of death has no opportunity of receiving either Penance or Extreme Unction. Of course, it should be noted that if he be in the state of mortal sin, he should acquire sanctifying grace before the reception of the Eucharist. In the circumstances, the only way of doing this is by an act of perfect contrition.

2. The administration of the Viaticum is one of the functions reserved in Law to the Parish Priest (Can. 850), and so *per se* his permission is required before any one else presumes to fulfill his proper duties. The Ordinarius, being the Pastor of the whole Diocese, would have a similar right and could give the necessary permission. We imagine, however, that in most cases the permission would have to be presumed, as there would not be time to have recourse either to the Parish Priest or the Ordinary.

3. For such an occasion, there is naturally no Ritus prescribed in the Liturgical books. We think the administration of Viaticum should be done as privately as possible. All that is necessary is that the sick man "eat" the Body of Christ.

## BAPTISM OF CHILDREN OF LAX CATHOLICS.

Dear Rev. Sir,

In the issue of the A.C.R. for January, 1944, I find an interesting point referring to the baptism of the children of Mixed Marriages, when there is a doubt about their Catholic education. This raises the problem concerning the refusal of Baptism when there is no moral certainty of the Catholic Education of the child concerned. This has reference not only to the offspring of Mixed Marriages, but also at times to the children of Catholic parents who have ceased to practise their Faith, who send elder children to the Public School, who never take any steps to have them instructed or prepared for the Sacraments or taught to attend Mass, etc. In such a case is one bound to refuse the Sacrament of Baptism to a younger child? It seems to me that any moral certainty is rather against the Catholic upbringing of the child than in favour of it. The fact that they ask to have the child baptised is to my mind no indication that they intend to rear him as a Catholic. It seems to me that, for many parents, Baptism is a social function without religious significance of any kind. Do you think that Priests interpret the Law in this matter with a leniency never intended by the Legislator?

P.J.C.

## REPLY.

The case contemplated unfortunately can occur, and a Priest will hesitate "to throw pearls before swine". We think, however, that P.J.C. is rather stricter than the Legislator in his views.

The Code deals with the Baptism of children of various classes of parents.

a) Children of Catholic parents should be baptised. Can. 770 lays down that Parish Priests and Preachers are to warn the *faithful* of their obligation to have their children baptised as soon as possible. Thus, for this class, there is no question of whether they may or may not be baptised: they should be baptised, and that as soon as possible.

b) Children of Parents who are classed as *infideles*, that is unbaptised persons, may be baptised even against the wishes of the parents, if it is prudently foreseen that they will die before reaching the use of reason.

Outside the danger of death they may be baptised only if two conditions are fulfilled: other-wise it is wrong to baptise them. The

two conditions are: 1. Precautions must be taken for the Catholic education of the Child—*catholicae ejus educationi cautum sit*; and 2. The parents or guardians, or at least one of them must consent; except in the case where the parents, which term includes also the grandparents or guardians, have lost their rights over the child, or at any rate can no longer exercise them.

c) Children of other non-catholics, i.e., heretics, schismatics and apostates, where both parents are non-catholics, generally speaking, fall under this same rule. The same two conditions are required: precautions for the catholic up-bringing of the child and consent of his parents or guardians.

The first of these conditions is placed to safeguard the reverence due to the Sacrament, as it would obviously be unlawful to baptise a child in circumstances where perversion was inevitable. What the Code prescribes is not that there be moral certainty that the child will be brought up a Catholic, but that precautions be taken—*cautum sit*—for his catholic education. This phrase is interpreted by Theologians in the light of replies of the Holy See to mean that there must be some hope that the child will be reared a catholic. (See A.C.R., Jan., 1944).

The second condition is to protect the rights which parents have from the natural Law to educate their children.

To come to the case of our correspondent: Are the parents he has in mind Apostates? Usually, they are not. They have given up the practice of their religion, but they have not abandoned the Faith altogether. It would seem that the mere fact of their bringing their children to be baptised is an indication that the Faith is not dead. Every Priest knows of the return of such people to their duties on the occasion of a Mission, a death in the family, or the other numerous ways of the workings of God's grace. We would say that all hope is not to be given up of the catholic education of such children, and that they should be baptised. This is the opinion of Noldin, Prummer, Damen, to mention a few of the modern authors.

Of course, if a Pastor was certain that perversion was inevitable, that the ceremony of Baptism was only a social event, he should not profane the Sacrament: but he must be certain. To refuse the Sacraments to those who ask for them is too serious a step to take unless one is absolutely sure of one's ground.



## OBLIGATION OF NURSES TO CONFER PRIVATE BAPTISM.

Dear Rev. Sir,

1. Would you kindly explain what obligation rests upon nurses in Maternity Hospitals to administer the Sacrament of Baptism, especially to the children of non-catholic parents.

2. Would a nurse be bound to baptise the child of non-catholic parents with the risk of a severe reprimand from the Hospital authorities and perhaps dismissal?

3. What should she do, if the danger of death is only probable? Is she to put herself to great inconvenience, for instance forfeit her hours off duty, in the likelihood that a child may become worse and be in danger of death?

### REPLY.

Baptism is necessary for salvation, according to the words of Our Lord: "Unless a man be born again of water and of the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter the kingdom of God" (Jn. 3/5). For an infant, who is incapable of making an act of perfect charity, the only means of obtaining salvation is by actual reception of the Sacrament. So the Roman Ritual enjoins that Parish Priests should see to it that the faithful, especially mid-wives, physicians and surgeons, should be instructed as to how to administer this sacrament in case of necessity.

The obligation of caring for the baptism of children falls, in the first place, on their parents, or on those who lawfully take the place of the parents. In a Maternity Hospital, the authorities in charge of the Hospital are in loco parentis until such time as the mother is well enough to assume the care of her offspring. If the parents express any reasonable wishes with regard to their children, it is the duty of the Hospital authorities to endeavour to carry them out; if the parents' wishes are unreasonable, they are not obliged to follow them, and in some cases may be bound not to do so. This would be true if the parents desired something which would be seriously contrary to the welfare of the child, whether temporal or spiritual. Those in charge of a Hospital are obliged to do their best for the patients entrusted to them; to give them suitable medical care, etc., and above all to see that they have all the spiritual helps they need. Baptism, for a child in danger of death, is most necessary, so much so, that if the child dies without it, he would be deprived for eternity of the Vision of God. He is in extreme spiritual need, and the law of charity binds any person who

can to go to his assistance and administer the Sacrament. Objections to the ministration of Baptism in this case would be unreasonable; being against the divine Law, and should not be heeded. If a Priest can be had, he should baptise the child, a deacon in preference to another cleric, a cleric rather than a lay-man, and a man before a woman. But the important thing is that the child be baptised, and often the only way to secure this is for the nurse to baptise him herself. There is then frequently an obligation on nurses and others in Maternity Hospitals to administer private Baptism to children in danger of death: this obligation is one of charity and it is grave.

With regard to the children of Catholic parents, no difficulty presents itself, because it can always be presumed that the parents are only too anxious for the gates of heaven to be opened to their children. But what is to be done with the children of non-catholic parents? We believe that in some Hospitals, at least, the custom is to consult the parents about baptism and to accede to their wishes. All is well, if they agree, but what is to be done if they refuse to consent to have their child christened? We are informed that if the parents are unwilling, the hospital authorities take no further action; and it is here that the Catholic nurse will find herself in a quandary. We have already remarked that any objection of the parents, in this case, is unreasonable and need not be heeded, for the right of every child of Adam to share in the Redemption of Christ far exceeds the natural right of parents over their children's destiny. Unbaptised children about to die are in extreme spiritual necessity and one is bound to undergo any inconvenience to help them. The conclusion is that the obligation of administering Baptism to a dying child holds in every case, independently of what the parents or guardians may believe concerning the nature or necessity of this Sacrament.

2. Would the fear of severe reprimand or even of dismissal excuse from this obligation of charity? Strictly speaking, it would not. The only reason which would justify one in not going to the help of another in extreme spiritual need is the fear of greater evils which might arise, e.g., odium or unjust ridicule that would follow for the Church or Religion in general, the danger that it would be made more difficult, or perhaps impossible, to come to the assistance of persons in similar necessity in the future. We think that, in some cases at least, these consequences would not be altogether fanciful, and too much insistence on her rights might only make her position more difficult for

the nurse, and thus she would not have an opportunity to baptise children in danger of death, on future occasions. A sensible woman will sum up the situation and act with all prudence: she will seize any opportunity to baptise the child, if need be, unostentatiously; and if she finds that she cannot do this, and any other line of action will only make things more difficult or perhaps impossible in similar cases in the future, she can leave the matter to the Providence of God.

3. If the danger of the death of the child is only probable, there is no obligation to take any steps to baptise him. In fact, unless it can be prudently foreseen that a child of non-catholics will die in infancy, it is forbidden to baptise him, unless in the circumstances we have explained in a previous question.

With regard to the inconvenience the nurse must be prepared to suffer in waiting, etc., lest the child become worse, we think that her responsibilities, generally, would cease when her hours of duty finished. She can presume that those who relieve her know their obligations and that the child will be safe in their keeping.

JAMES MADDEN.

# Liturgy

## BEATIFICATION AND CANONISATION.

Dear Rev. Sir,

I was recently engaged in a discussion with some clerical friends regarding beatification and canonisation. We agreed that there is a general lack of knowledge of this section of church legislation. If space will permit, will you kindly discuss the subject in the *A.C.R.*

1. We speak of a "process" of canonisation. Does this imply that the enquiry is conducted on judicial lines? Would you outline the procedure?

2. I am aware that the lengthy process now employed has not always obtained in church administration. What of those canonised prior to its introduction? Someone stated that they are not "properly" canonised. That does not seem feasible. And yet it was pointed out that some saints of former times do not seem to enjoy the same status as "modern" saints. Mention was made of the Emperor Charlemagne as a saint.

3., It was further asserted that some modern canonisations were made with a dispensation from ordinary rules of procedure. Saints Albert the Great and Thomas More were given as examples. However, no one could explain in what the dispensation consisted.

CURIOSUS.

### REPLY.

I. The procedure employed in causes of beatification and canonisation is certainly of a judicial character. In fact there are more formalities and more exacting attention to detail than in the most important suit at law, civil or ecclesiastical. It will be possible to give only a very brief outline of the processes, which, in their present form, date from the time of Urban VIII.

There is a broad distinction to be made between Ordinary or Informative processes, conducted by the Local Ordinary on his own authority, and Apostolic processes, conducted on the authority of the Holy See.

Ordinary or Informative Process—Personnel of Court.

Any member or group of the faithful may petition the Ordinary to commence proceedings for the beatification of a deceased servant of



God. The scope of the Ordinary's judicial enquiry will be to establish a *prima facie* case with a view to the cause being admitted by the Congregation of Rites. Thus it is designated "informative."

If the bishop undertakes the enquiry himself he may be the sole judge; otherwise three judges must be appointed. Pleading the case, as a petitioner in a civil case or as a promotor of justice in a criminal case, is the postulator or one of his vice-postulators. His office is to prosecute the case in every legitimate way, lodging formal petitions for the introduction of the cause, procuring witnesses, presenting documents by way of evidence, providing the expenses of the proceedings. On the other side stands the promotor of the faith (Devil's Advocate) whose duty it is to put forward every reasonable objection to the petition. He must be called to every session or, at least, examine the acts afterwards and he may intervene at any stage. His office may be compared to that of defender of the bond in matrimonial cases. Finally, as in all judicial processes, there must be a notary whose arduous task is to make a verbatim report of the proceedings and, in general, to act as secretary to the court. All these officials must take an oath to observe secrecy (until publication of the process) and to carry out their duties faithfully. The postulator must also swear that he will not employ any fraudulent or deceitful means.

### SCOPE OF INFORMATIVE PROCESS.

The Ordinary's enquiry is threefold—"de scriptis", "de fama sanctitatis et miraculorum", "de non-cultu". For the first enquiry all extant writings of the servant of God must be collected and examined, e.g., books, articles, sermons, letters, diaries. The second enquiry concerns the reputation for sanctity enjoyed by the deceased or his martyrdom and its cause; also the reputation for miracles. Detailed proofs are not required for the practice of all virtues in a heroic degree nor are stringent proofs of miracles exacted. This is an "informative" process whose scope is to examine the reputed virtues or martyrdom and the reports of miracles. Thirdly, the scope of the enquiry is to verify that the decrees of Urban VIII prohibiting public cult have been obeyed.

The postulator must provide witnesses to establish these three positions. Other witnesses may be named by the promoter of the faith or summoned "ex officio" by the judges. It is laid down in canon law that any person having knowledge of facts which may weaken the case for sanctity, martyrdom or miracles must reveal this knowledge

even though they have not been summoned. Non-Catholics may be admitted to testify. The confessor may not be admitted, even though released by his penitent from the obligation of the seal. Each witness is sworn to tell the truth before the deposition after deposing he swears to the truth of his evidence and promises under oath to observe secrecy until the process has been completed.

### INTRODUCTION OF THE CAUSE.

An authentic record of the foregoing proceedings is forwarded to the Congregation of Rites, which examines the process with a view to accepting or rejecting the case. A Cardinal is appointed to make a special study of the case and report to the Congregation. He is known as the Cardinal Relator. Firstly he nominates two revisers who, separately and unknown to the other, examine the enquiry "*de scriptis*", particularly with a view to establishing purity of faith and morals. Secondly the process "*de fama sanctitatis*, etc." is examined. The postulator synthesises the evidence in the form of a "*positio*". Against this the promotor of the faith formulates his objections, to which in turn the postulator submits his replies. These three documents are considered by the members of the Congregation who, if satisfied, will recommend that the Pope sign a commission for the introduction of the cause. Thirdly the process "*de non-cultu*" is examined and if this scrutiny is satisfactory, the case may proceed.

### APOSTOLIC PROCESSES.

The case is now withdrawn from the Ordinary's jurisdiction. The proceedings continue to take place in the diocesan court but only by the authority of the Holy See in accordance with instructions received therefrom. "Remissorial Letters" are sent from the Congregation nominating five clerics to act as judges; likewise, instructions are sent from the Promotor-General, residing at Rome, to two clerics, called sub-promotors, who act as his delegates. The rules of procedure are similar to those employed in the Ordinary process.

The scope of the Apostolic process is to establish,

(1) that the servant of God practised each of the theological and moral virtues in an extraordinary or heroic degree, *or* that he suffered martyrdom for the faith,

(2) that at least two miracles have been performed through his intercession.

## FURTHER PROCEEDINGS AT THE CONGREGATION OF RITES.

When the record of these proceedings has been received at Rome there are prepared, as in the case of the Ordinary process, the "positio" of the postulator the promotor's objections and the replies thereto. Then follow three sessions of the Congregation upon each of the two questions raised—called respectively the Antepreparatory, the Preparatory, and the General Sessions. At the General Session the Pope presides. If a favourable decree is issued after the first threefold session—on the fact of heroic virtue or of martyrdom for the faith—the Servant of God receives the title of "Venerable". If the second threefold session results in a favourable verdict a further session "De Tuto" is held in the presence of the Pope, the question being discussed in these terms: "Is it safe to proceed to the beatification of the servant of God?" If the answer to this question is in the affirmative, the Pope will proceed to issue a decree of formal beatification.

### PROCEDURE FOR CANONISATION.

Firstly, an authentic document must be produced to establish that beatification has taken place; otherwise a judicial process must be set up to prove this fact.

Secondly, Apostolic processes must be set up to prove miracles performed since the beatification. The process is carried out in the diocesan court and in the three sessions at Rome just as for beatification. Finally there is the session "De Tuto", after which the Pope, if he thinks fit, arranges the day for solemn canonisation.

From the foregoing sketchy outline of procedure it will be seen that these processes are strictly judicial in character, involving even more formalities than other cases.

## II. CANONISATION BEFORE URBAN VIII.

In order to answer the second question it will be necessary firstly, to examine the exact meaning of the terms beatification and canonisation and secondly, to recall in brief outline the historical development of ecclesiastical law and practice in this matter.

Canonisation, as now understood, means a final and solemn declaration of the Pope whereby a beatified person is commended under precept to the veneration of the Universal Church. Beatification is the Pope's permitting of public cult with certain restrictions. Canonisation, then, is preceptive and involves universal cult, while

beatification is permissive and implies certain restrictions. It is plain that only the Supreme Pontiff may canonise in this sense, as he alone may issue a precept binding the whole Church. It will emerge from the following historical sketch that in former times only beatification was in vogue, though the terms were used indiscriminately.

During the first three centuries only martyrs were honoured with public cult. Their veneration was usually a spontaneous demonstration of the faithful permitted by the local bishop. There is indeed some evidence of bishops intervening, but chiefly to prohibit veneration of deceased whose martyrdom for the faith was not established. Saint Optatus records that a Christian matron of Carthage, by name Lucilla, was reprimanded for having kissed the relics of a reputed martyr whose claims to martyrdom had not been legitimately proved—he was not included amongst “*martyres vindicati*”. It will be recalled that great diligence was exercised in recording the trials and deaths of martyrs. Similarly when “confessors” and others as distinct from martyrs began to be revered the authority of the local bishop permitted or prohibited the cult. But the role of the bishops was more commonly a negative one—to tolerate tacitly or prohibit positively what had arisen from the devotion of the faithful.

Towards the end of the seventh century the intervention of bishops became more positive and more frequent. A formal court of enquiry was not always held, but reliable information was sought out before bishops or local councils decreed “canonisation”.

From the end of the tenth century canonisation came to be referred to the Pope, though it was not until two centuries later that the right to canonise was reserved exclusively to the Holy See. Centralisation took place gradually. The same reasons had led to more active episcopal intervention from the end of the seventh century now led, with the expansion of the church, to papal intervention. The first example of solemn canonisation is generally agreed to have been that of Saint Ulric, Bishop of Augsburg, in 993. There is not a clear record of the procedure followed, but the Pope’s enquiry centred upon the two essential themes of the saint’s sanctity and the performance of miracles. During the eleventh and twelfth centuries bishops still enjoyed the right of canonisation but exercised it less frequently, while more frequent recourse was had to the Holy See.

The decree of Alexander III of 1173 was really the culmination of this practice. Canonisation was reserved to Rome and from this



time onwards enquiries became more minute, procedure more detailed and formal. Nevertheless some bishops insisted that they still retained the right to permit local cult.

Urban VIII by his decrees of 1625 and 1634 yet more definitely condemned any exercise of this power by local bishops. The rules of procedure embodied in the Code of Canon Law are substantially as drawn up by this Pope.

Of those locally honoured with the approval of the bishops, only those are now considered as beatified whose cult has been accepted expressly or tacitly by the Holy See, while only those are considered as canonised whose cult has been extended by the Holy See to the Universal Church.

### EMPEROR CHARLEMAGNE.

The Emperor Charlemagne was canonised in 1165 by Paschal III, an anti-pope supported by Frederick Barbarossa against Alexander III. This act was, of course, null and void. However, Charlemagne has continued to receive a local cult in some parts of Germany, Belgium, and France. Benedict XIV who, as a private canonist is the outstanding authority on this subject, maintained that continued tolerance of this cult by the Holy See amounted to beatification.

### III. SAINTS ALBERTUS MAGNUS AND THOMAS MORE.

In order to explain the case of Saint Albert the Great, canonised in 1931, it will be necessary to explain the distinction between formal and equivalent canonisation and beatification. The procedure outlined in reply to the first query is that which leads up to formal beatification and canonisation.

As the Pope is the source of law which is purely ecclesiastical, he may modify or disregard such provisions of Canon Law. Thus he could issue a decree of canonisation without any preliminaries at all—although, of course, he would not do so. In any case Urban VIII specified certain exceptions to the rules of procedure in question, namely, cases in which public cult had been allowed by the common consent of the church or by immemorial custom, by the writings of fathers and saints or by the long-continued tolerance of the Holy See. As immemorial custom involves a period of one hundred years, it follows that any public worship which was established in Catholic practice before the year 1534 is exempt from the provisions of Pope Urban's Decree (issued in 1634).

These are spoken of as the "excepted" cases or cases of beatification and canonisation "*per viam cultus*". It is the possession of public cult which provides the basis for the decree. In all other cases one purpose of the informative processes is to establish that public cult has not been given, in contravention of Pope Urban's decree. These ordinary cases are therefore said to proceed "*per viam non-cultus*".

If the Pope tolerates or permits a local cult which had grown up prior to 1534 there is equivalent beatification. If the Pope extends this cult to the universal Church without the formal judicial process it is equivalent or equipollent canonisation. This was the method by which Saint Albert was canonised. Another example in recent times was the canonisation of Saint Ephrem by Benedict XV. Public cult of Saint Ephrem had been practised in Syria since the fourth century.

It should not be concluded that such canonisations are carried out without lengthy and searching enquiries even though the long judicial process is omitted. In the case of Saint Albert there was a detailed critical study of his writings and life as well as of the cult paid to him. Furthermore the Promotor of the Faith intervenes as in formal cases. It is needless to add that this canonisation enjoys the same status as a papal pronouncement as does a formal decree, the arguments advanced in favour of infallibility applying equally in the two cases.

The case of Saint Thomas More is different again. For canonisation proof is required of two miracles since formal beatification or of three miracles since equivalent beatification. St. Thomas More was formally canonised but with a dispensation from the proof of miracles. In the case of martyrs such dispensation is often granted for beatification. This is the first case on record of a similar dispensation for canonisation.

JAMES CARROLL.

# Notes

## HIS EMINENCE CARDINAL GILROY.

As this number of the *A.C.R.* goes to press the Catholics of Sydney are preparing to welcome in a warm and royal fashion the first Australian Cardinal. It will in all truth be an historical occasion when the zealous and kindly Prince of the Church enters his cathedral church. His Eminence's predecessors rest there with one exception, Archbishop Vaughan, whose remains, due to Cardinal Gilroy's persistent interest, will soon, we trust, join the great band. English and Irish, they sleep together in that spot so dear to all Australian Catholics. With them are joined Father Therry and the other priests of the days of old. Would that they could see this day! What a holy joy would be theirs in seeing a son of the Church, which they had planted and guarded in its struggling days of infancy, entering St. Mary's clad in the Roman Purple. It is indeed a consummation of their arduous labours and a new chapter has opened in the history of the Catholic Church in Australia. The men who planted the Faith in this country need have no fears for the future, as Cardinal Gilroy yields to none of them in zeal for the Faith and devotion to the See of Peter.

Much has been written, and much will be written on this great subject, but the *A.C.R.* desires to raise its modest voice in the great welcome which all Australia has made to her distinguished son. May God bless and protect His Eminence the Cardinal and grant him length of days!

\*                      \*                      \*                      \*

## MONSIGNOR NEVIN

Since the *A.C.R.* began its second life in 1924, Monsignor Nevin's name has been connected with practically every issue, saving a few numbers while he was absent in Europe. Therefore it is with regret we announce that Monsignor Nevin has relinquished the direction of the Moral Theology and Canon Law Sections of the *A.C.R.* This able and tenacious theologian brought to his task, not only wide and exact learning, but above all, intense sincerity and love of truth. Scattered through the past volumes of the *A.C.R.* is the material for a Moral Theology in the light of Australian conditions. We know the friends of Monsignor Nevin have urged him to collect this material and publish a book which would be a monument to his scientific labours. Our readers, we know, join us in the hope that this volume will be printed. We trust, also, that the future volumes of the *A.C.R.* will attract the ready pen of the distinguished theologian who was one of the original founders of the *A.C.R.*

## MONSIGNOR O'DONNELL.

Monsignor O'Donnell has resigned the editorship of the *A.C.R.* His work is too fresh in the mind of our readers to need comment. Thanks in no small measure to Monsignor O'Donnell, the dark years of the war were survived by the *A.C.R.* With its devoted band of readers it emerges into what we all hope will be the brighter days of peace. The Manager is now able to accept new subscriptions as the paper position has greatly improved. We remind our readers that their questions on the various questions of professional interest are the life blood of the *Record*. Questions on Moral Theology and Liturgy have been frequent in the past, but the *A.C.R.* would welcome enquiries in Sacred Scripture, Dogmatic Theology, and in other subjects of professional interest. No section during the war suffered more than the Book Reviews. Our reviewers made strenuous efforts, but books were few and far between. Efforts are being made to renew contact with the European firms publishing theological works, but for some time our readers must be patient awaiting more spacious days.

\* \* \* \*

## THE PEOPLE'S EUCHARISTIC LEAGUE.

## A QUESTION ANSWERED.

In a certain parish there exists a local centre of the People's Eucharistic League. It was canonically erected by the Ordinary of the place and then duly affiliated to the Roman Primaria on September 8, 1908. At the beginning the names of members were written in a special register. At the same time was inaugurated a publicly conducted Holy Hour of Adoration on the First Sunday of every month. This monthly Hour has been kept up and is consistently well attended. The required prayers for the intentions of the Pope are recited at the end of the Hour in order to gain the Plenary Indulgence. May all who are present for this Hour gain the Plenary Indulgence even though their names have not been inscribed in the register?

The answer to this question calls for distinctions and explanations. The question as it stands seems to imply that there is only one Plenary Indulgence that may be gained and that it is the one granted only to members of the People's Eucharistic League. In this hypothesis those who are present for this Hour, but whose names are not inscribed on the register, do not gain this particular Plenary Indulgence.

This Plenary Indulgence has been granted by the Holy See exclusively to members of the League. No one can be a member or be-



come a member whose name has not been written in a register of the society. This is the general law of the Church and applies to other associations of the faithful also.

Canon 694, p. 2. "Ut autem de receptione constet, INSCRIPTIO IN ALBO ASSOCIATIONIS FIERI OMNINO DEBET; imo haec inscriptio, si associatio in personam moralem erecta fuerit,—(This is true for the case under consideration. When the local branch was canonically erected by the Ordinary it became a moral person.)—"EST AD VALIDITATEM NECESSARIA".

According to an answer of the Sacred Congregation for Indulgences, September 25, 1845, the material inscription or actual writing of the names in the register need not be done by the Director himself. He may ask someone else, even a lay man or woman, to do this for him. It will suffice for the formal inscription for the Director to sign his name at the bottom of the page or list of names inscribed.

It may be objected that a decree of the Holy Office, April 23, 1914, declared that the gaining of Indulgences did not depend on the inscription in the register provided the other formalities for admission to membership had been complied with.

It is doubtful whether this decree still holds since the promulgation of the new Code of Canon Law, especially in view of the Canon just quoted. Canonists disagree. However to make sure of gaining the Indulgences the names should be put in the register. The decree itself reads in part, "firma remanente in conscientia obligatione inscribendi et transmittendi nomina". "Transmittendi" that is to a place that has a register in case there was none where the names were received.

Faculty 23 of the Pagella given in Appendix X on page 159 of the official edition of the decrees of the IVth Plenary Council of Australia and New Zealand, says: "Adscribendi Christifideles Confraternitatibus a S. Sede adprobatis quarum instituendarum jus apostolico ex privilegio aliis reservatum est (can. 686, p. 2), una excepta Confraternitate SSmi Rosarii; . . ."

It has been asked whether this faculty dispenses from the writing of the names in a register of the People's Eucharistic League. The answer is that it does not, and for several reasons. First of all, the League is not a Confraternity. Secondly, even if the term "Confraternity" in this faculty could be construed to include other pious associations of the faithful,—and Vromont for one does not think so,—the right to institute or establish the League is not reserved by apostolic

privilege to the Fathers of the Blessed Sacrament or to any other Religious Institute. It may be erected by any Ordinary in his diocese.

Furthermore, even in those cases to which this faculty applies, the word "adscribendi" is to be interpreted in conformity with Canon Law as including the inscription of the names. Consequently the "onus inscriptionis" still remains. If the Sacred Congregation by this faculty intended to exempt priests from this onus it would have added, as it does explicitly in faculty 21 of the same Pagella, "sine onere inscriptionis".

To sum up, if the persons present at a Holy Hour of Adoration sponsored by the People's Eucharistic League are to gain the special Plenary Indulgence offered to members only, then their names must be inscribed in the official register of any duly affiliated branch or centre of the League.

The question or difficulty may have arisen from confusing the monthly Holy Hour devotions in the parish with the League, as though they went together and the one called the other. One can easily understand how this came about. The League requires that its members spend at least one hour every month before the Blessed Sacrament. When the League was started in the parish the natural thing to do was to arrange for a collective or public Holy Hour that would make it easier for the members to fulfil their obligation. From that it was a short step to thinking that mere presence at the monthly Hour was the same as membership in the League, and consequently that all present could gain the Indulgence.

This impression may also have arisen from the fact that when the Ordinary gave the decree of erection for the parish branch he, at the same time granted permission, and, in some cases, expressed his desire for a Holy Hour of Exposition every month. This action in turn gave rise to another impression that when a local branch of the League was erected in a parish it carried with it permission to expose the Blessed Sacrament, at least, for one hour every month. This is not correct. Canon 1274, n. 1, explicitly states that permission to expose the Blessed Sacrament in the monstrance must, in every case, be obtained from the Ordinary, even when the church belongs to "exempt Religious". This permission is required not only when the Exposition is to last for one hour or longer, but even for simple Benediction with the monstrance.

It may be well to repeat that there is no necessary connection between the People's Eucharistic League and a parish public monthly

Holy Hour. They are independent of one another. One may exist in a parish without the other, and both may exist together. Exposition is not required by the League. Members are free to spend their monthly Hour before the Blessed Sacrament reserved in the Tabernacle. They are likewise free to do their Hour on any day and at any time they choose.

It was stated at the beginning of this article that the question put seemed to imply that there was only one Plenary Indulgence that might be gained, viz., the one offered to members of the League. There is, however, another Plenary Indulgence, this one offered to all the faithful who take part in what is popularly called a "Holy Hour".

No. 139 in the 1938 edition of "*Preces et Pia Opera* etc." says: "Fidelibus, qui in qualibet ecclesia . . . PIUM EXERCITIUM, quod vulgo 'Horam Sanctam' vocant, PUBLICE PERACTUM, per integram horam participaverint, conceditur: Indulgentia plenaria . . ."

This would seem quite clear on the face of it, but a difficulty arises as to the nature of this "pium exercitium" to which the Indulgence is attached, whether it be called a "Holy Hour" or not.

The text gives the purpose of this pious exercise: "ad recolendam Jesu Christi Passionem et Mortem" and also "ET ad flagrantissimum Ejus amorem, quo ductus divinum Eucharistiam instituit, meditandum colendumque".

If the monthly Holy Hour does not do these two things it seems doubtful whether this Indulgence may be gained, even though the Blessed Sacrament may be exposed for the entire Hour. The text does not say that this Hour must be before the Blessed Sacrament. The Indulgence may be gained even if the Blessed Sacrament is not in the church at all!

The practical conclusion to draw from what has been said is to have those who attend this monthly Hour become members of the People's Eucharistic League and have their names inscribed in the register. It does not matter where the register may be, provided it is the official register of a branch that has been canonically erected and duly affiliated to the Roman Primaria of the League.

The formalities for the establishing of a parish branch are quite simple. Printed forms for this purpose may be obtained from the head centre at St. Francis' Church, Melbourne, C.1. One of these forms is that for the required statutes of the parish centre. This form is in English. The three other forms are in Latin. Form One is the letter of the Parish Priest to the Ordinary. Form Two is the Ordinary's decree erecting the parish society. Form Three is the "testi-

monial letter" from the Ordinary to the Fathers of the Blessed Sacrament recommending the affiliation of this local centre.

By a decree of the Sacred Congregation of the Council, June 26, 1926, the Primaria or arch-association of the People's Eucharistic League in the church of San Claudio at Rome was empowered to delegate its own power of affiliating—which it had received from Pope Leo XIII in 1897—to other centres already existing elsewhere. This was done for the region of Australasia on January 29, 1934, when it granted this delegated power to the centre in the church of St. Francis, Melbourne. Consequently when Form Three is received at St. Francis' the official diploma of affiliation is issued and sent to the parish centre.

In some places the People's Eucharistic League is known as the Archconfraternity of the Blessed Sacrament. Strictly speaking this is inexact. When it was founded by Blessed Peter Julian Eymard to associate the faithful with the Religious of the Congregation of the Blessed Sacrament in their Work of Adoration and in their Eucharistic apostolate, he called it the "Aggregation of the Blessed Sacrament". It was first given canonical status by the Venerable de Mazenod, Archbishop of Marseilles, on November 17, 1859, but in the preceding year Pius IX., in a papal brief signed "propria manu", had already granted to these lay "aggregates" a Plenary Indulgence for spending one hour before the Blessed Sacrament. In 1875 the same Pope made a further grant of many other Plenary and Partial Indulgences to members of this "Aggregation".

In 1887 the Blessed Sacrament Fathers moved their head house from Paris to Rome at the church of San Claudio. (Their founder had died in 1868.) From Rome the "Aggregation" spread to almost every part of the Catholic world. In English-speaking countries it was variously known as "The Eucharistic Union", "The Union of Adoration" and "The Guard of Honour of the Blessed Sacrament". The name of "The People's Eucharistic League" seems to have been given to it at the time of the first American Eucharistic Convention at Covington, Kentucky, when the priests' branch was called "The Priests' Eucharistic League". This was in 1894.

Then on May 8, 1897, Pope Leo XIII. raised the branch at San Claudio to the rank of an Archconfraternity, that is, he gave it the right and the power to affiliate,—"*sibi aggregare*" is the expression used in Canon Law,—similar associations in all parts of the world, and thereby communicate to them all the communicable Indulgences, privileges and



other spiritual favours it had itself received from the Apostolic See. (Canons 720-722.)

As a consequence the "Aggregation" began to be called the Archconfraternity of the Blessed Sacrament. However, since the promulgation of the new Code of Canon Law a very precise and definite meaning has been given to the term "archconfraternity", so that it can no longer be applied properly to the People's Eucharistic League.

To continue calling the League the Archconfraternity of the Blessed Sacrament may lead to confusion, because there is another society that has a strict right to that title. It is the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament erected in the church of Santa Maria sopra Minerva in Rome in 1539. It was made an Archconfraternity by Paul III. in 1548. The title of "The Archconfraternity of the Blessed Sacrament" was confirmed to it by Paul V. in 1606.

When Blessed Eymard submitted his ideas to Pius IX. in 1855, the Pope said: "I am convinced that this Work comes from God. The Church needs it. Let every means be taken to make the Blessed Sacrament better known and loved". Leo XIII. declared: "It is not possible to have a Work more beautiful than the Adoration of the Most Blessed Sacrament". Pius X. said: "The Work of Adoration surpasses all other Works of piety. It is the Work of Works, the Source of all the others".

In the course of an address to the Roman members of the People's Eucharistic League on June 24, 1923, Pius XI. spoke at length of their practice of spending an Hour before the Blessed Sacrament, saying that "this practice is the source of ineffable and incommensurable blessings and favours". Finally, Cardinal Pacelli, then Papal Secretary of State, in a letter of congratulations to the Director of the League in Italy, May 31, 1937, wrote of "the multiple fruits for good that souls derive from" membership.

May these words of the Vicars of Christ on earth be an inspiration to the clergy of Australia to encourage the faithful to become members of the People's Eucharistic League, and to spend at least one hour in every month at the feet of Our Divine Master in the Sacrament of His Love!

W. A. FOX, S.S.S.

## RINGS AND GEMS.

This note on "Rings and Gems" is concerned with finger-rings and biblical precious stones only. Without any pretention to scientific method, we propose to set down a few things which will be of general interest. Those who wish to know more may consult the various biblical and ecclesiastical encyclopaedias. The long article on "Rings" in DACL is, of course, full of facts; and the articles on biblical gems, in general and particular, by Father Fonck in the *Lexicon Biblicum* will furnish all that the "busy parish priest" is likely to require. Besides the light on the precious stones of the High Priest's breastplate to be derived from Josephus (*Antiquities*, III, nn. 166-170 and *Jewish War* V, n. 234) and from Pliny the Elder (*Hist. Nat.* I, 37), there is a short and interesting treatise on the "Twelve Gems" by St. Epiphanius of Salamis (PG. 43, 293-372).

The work ring (*daktulios*) figures only once in the New Testament—in the parable of the Prodigal Son. In the Alexandrian version, the same Greek work *daktulios* translates three Hebrew words: 1) *chôthâm*, which means "a seal" or "signet", occurring for the first time in the history of Jacob and Tamar, and having the variant form *chôthemeth*, which occurs once in the same passage to signify the self-same signet; 2) *tabba'ath*, which also etymologically means an "impression-instrument", but is commonly used of all sorts of rings, especially finger-rings, and first occurs in the history of Joseph, to whom Pharaoh gave his own ring; 3) 'izqâ', not really Hebrew but Aramaic, with etymological meaning of "round hole", hence a rounded thing, a ring. It occurs only twice in one sentence of Daniel (6: 17).

It will be gathered from this that the Septuagintal *daktulios*, in spite of its name, does not always mean a finger-ring; for instance, the four rings near the four corners of the Ark, for the purpose of carrying, are called *daktulioi*. Neither was the signet always a finger-ring. It was often carried suspended from the neck. Hence the spouse of the Canticle says: "Put me as a signet on thy heart, as a signet on thy arm". A modern equivalent would be: "Put me as a watch in your vest pocket, as a watch on your wrist". The signet ring on the finger of the right hand can however stand equally well as a symbol of something precious and dear to one. Such seems to be the meaning in passages like those in which Zorobabel (Eccli. 49: 13) and the theocratic King Jechonias (Jer. 22: 24) are compared to a ring on the right hand (of God).

As far as biblical evidence goes the finger-ring does not seem to have been worn by Hebrew men as a mere ornament. Women wore finger-rings for ornament, as we know from the history of Judith and from the luxury list of Isaias in his indictment of the women of Jerusalem. There is, it must be remembered, no such thing as a marriage ring either in the Old or the New Testament.

Outside of the Hebrew world also the ring is very ancient. The early Egyptian and Mycenaean rings show that their purpose was often adornment. Gold rings seem to have been worn indifferently by all classes in Greece; but in Rome the use of rings in the precious metal was first restricted to senators, later extended to those of equestrian rank, and finally became general. The bridal or betrothal ring, originally of iron, is traceable to Rome. Christians followed the Roman fashion of wearing rings, often with an extravagance which drew sharp criticism not only from the rigorous Tertullian, but also from St. Cyprian, St. Jerome, and the compiler of the Apostolic Constitutions. Better Christians, however, sanctified the finger-ring, for we learn from Clement of Alexandria (*Paedagogus* III, 11) that they engraved the head-plates or the inset gems with such motives as the Dove, the Fish, the Ship sailing to the heavenly port, the Lyre of Orpheus, the Anchor. Museums show many examples of other Christian symbols on rings, as also of inscriptions and of the monogram of Christ. Byzantine rings often had scenic engravings. Even relics were set in rings, but in this case the ring was worn suspended from the neck.

The Bishop's ring (Pastoral or Pontifical ring) was originally a signet, like other rings of office. Attestation of such pastoral rings in Latin lands is found in sermon 217 of St. Augustine. Possibly it was from this practical-official destination that the Bishop's ring passed to be a sign of the episcopal office, but it seems that the development of ring and staff symbols of the pastoral charge belongs to the Germanic peoples. Investiture with the ring at consecration or installation is first mentioned in Visigothic Spain. It occurs almost contemporaneously in the fourth Council of Toledo (633) and in the Ecclesiastical Offices of St. Isidore of Seville. The Bishop's ring is gold with an unengraved stone. Everybody knows that it is worn on the fourth finger of the right hand and at Pontifical functions over the gloves. From medieval times its mystic symbolism is explained by many authors, notably, Honorius of Autun, Durandus and Innocent III. Traditionally it was a sign of honour, but being a digital ornament it came to signify

the gifts of the Holy Ghost, since the Divine Spirit is the "finger of God Most High" (cpr. Luke 11: 20). When the episcopal ring became general in the ninth and tenth century, the matrimonial significance already attached to it passed to the spiritual union between the Bishop and his diocese. We need only refer to the case of Pope Formosus, to recall to our readers' minds that in wide circles in the ninth century the translation of a Bishop to another See was regarded as intolerable divorce.

Amongst episcopal rings a special place belongs to the "annulus piscatoris" or Fisherman's Ring. This is the Pope's official ring, and an exclusively papal distinctive. It bears engraved the scene of Luke V—St. Peter drawing the fishing net into the boat. Above is the name of the Pontiff. It is given to a newly elected Pope by the Cardinal Camerlengo, and at the Pontiff's death must be broken. At least from the time of Clement IV (1265-1268), this ring has been used for the sealing of Papal Briefs, that is, letters of a less solemn character than Bulls, ending in the formula: "Datum Romae, apud s. Petrum, *sub annulo piscatoris*, die xv Martii, anno MDCCCCXXXVI (not anno Incarnationis Dominicae millesimo nongentesimo quadragesimo sexto, idibus Martii, as in Bulls), Pontificatus Nostri anno octavo". Then comes the autograph signature of the Secretary of Briefs, and the red stamp of the Fisherman's Ring (or a red wax seal, if the Brief is to a Prince).

The ring which religious women take at profession, is a sign which, as far as available ecclesiastical documents reveal it, is connected with the name of St. Agnes. She found her greatest panegyrist in the Father who was perhaps the greatest preacher of virginity that the Church has had since the Apostles, namely, St. Ambrose. In a sermon on St. Agnes (PL. 17, 701) occurs the phrase: "*annulo fidei Agnes se asserit subarrhatam*". Practically the same phrase, signifying her betrothal with the ring of fidelity, is found in her festal office. It is, however, from the thirteenth century that the taking of the ring by religious women on profession day becomes the universal symbol of their marriage to the Heavenly Bridegroom.

The marriage ring derives, as we have already said, from Roman custom. But the Roman ring of iron was a pledge accompanying betrothal, not marriage, and it seems certain that in the early Christian centuries such a ring given by a man to a woman was in view of future marriage—*arrahae sponsalitiac*, a pledge that he would not take another



bride. When and how this pledge of marriage in the future came to be the attestation of marriage in the present is not easy to ascertain. The first marriage ring we know appears in the middle of the ninth century, when Judith, the daughter of Charles the Bald was married to the English King Ethelwulf in the presence of Archbishop Hincmar of Rheims. Having examined the text of a passage from Gregory of Tours' life of St. Leobardus, I doubt if the ring mentioned there (*Vitae Patrum* 20) is a marriage ring, but I have no means of testing statements that are made about the mention of rings properly matrimonial in West Gothic and Longobardic Laws. It may be that the marriage ring proper can be traced back some two centuries before the Carolingian age.

A detail concerning the wearing of the marriage ring deserves notice. Perhaps, most married women, if asked why the marriage ring is carried on the annular finger of the *left* hand will give an answer vaguely felt to be traditional: "Because that is the finger of the heart". The truth is that it has been regarded as such from very early times. The embalmers of Ancient Egypt discovered or thought that they discovered a small nerve (or muscle) going from the second last finger of the left hand to the heart. The second century essayist, Aulus Gellius, has given us this interesting piece of information. Here is the text from his *Noctes Atticae* (x, 10): Veteres graecos annulum habuisse in digito accepimus sinistrae manus, qui minimo est proximus. Romanos quoque homines aiunt sic plerumque annulis usitatos. Causam esse huius rei Apion in libris Aegyptiacis hanc dicit, quod insectis apertisque humanis corporibus...reperitum est, nervum quendam tenuissimum ab eo uno digito, de quo diximus, ad cor hominis pergere ac pervenire; propterea non inscitum visum esse, eum potissime digitum tali honore decorandum, qui continens est et quasi connexus esse cum principatu cordis videretur". This connexion of the ring of betrothal and fidelity with the heart is already Christian property in the writings of St. Isidore of Seville, who, however, makes the little nerve or muscle "a vein".

\*

\*

\*

\*

On gems we must not be verbose. It is outside of our intention to go into the mineralogical composition of biblical precious stones. As far as they can be identified, they seem to belong to four classes of minerals. The largest number would come under silica. The best-known crystalline silica are rock-crystal and quartz, which have such a coloured brother as the amethyst. To this same group belongs the

amorphous "chalcedony" which includes the ancient red sardius, green jasper, and banded onyx. Agate is an opaque silicon of different colours,

Silica combined with metallic oxides give silicates. Ancient topaz (silicate of magnesium) and ancient chalcedony (silicate of copper), and the ancient beryl, emerald, and sapphire (supposing the last to be lapis lazuli) would all be silicates.

Some biblical stones are also said to be of the generic sort denominated as alumina and aluminates, but we confess that we know nearly as little of modern scientific mineralogy as Moses or Ezechiel, or St. John did.

It is from these three writers that we get our chief lists of biblical precious stones; but, as Ezechiel sees nine of the self-same stones appointed by Moses for the High Priest's breastplate on the apparel of the Prince of Tyre (28: 13), the Prophet adds nothing to the Legislator, except two stones, which appear outside of the Tyrian list, in other passages. St. John, in describing the foundations of the heavenly Jerusalem has four stones amongst his twelve, which do not coincide with those of the breastplate. That makes a total of sixteen, to which Isaias and Ezechiel add a *chodchod* which is not easy to identify, and Jeremias, Ezechiel, Zacharias add a *shamir* which is almost certainly adamant or diamond. Varieties of rock crystal called respectively *qerach* and *gabish* and *'eqdach* appear in Isaias 54: 12 (the New Sion) and in Job. Twenty-one is, therefore, a fairly exhaustive list of biblical precious stones.

In our identifications of the single gems, we must take care to consider only stones that were known to the ancients. Besides the Septuagint and the Vulgate, Josephus and Pliny are of special assistance. For the twelve stones of the breastplate our identifications must not fall on hard varieties, which the ancient Hebrews could not have inscribed with the names of the twelve tribes. However, the gems of the pectoral were no common stones, for Josephus—somewhat given to exaggeration, it is true—describes them as "extraordinary both for size and beauty", and as "being such an ornament as men could not procure, on account of their surpassing value" (*Antiquities* III, 166).

The stones were set in four lines of three, the order being presumably from right to left. Josephus says that the names of the twelve Patriarchs were inscribed in the order of their birth, and St. Epiphanius follows the same supposition. The last two children of Lia, Zabulon, and Issachar, were therefore separated from the other four,

and not joined to them, as in the prophecy of Jacob. This serial disposition of eponymous Patriarchs and stones is the only one for which we have any positive testimony, and consequently we shall follow it, although it leaves no sort of correspondence between the tribal names in the Apocalypse (from which Dan is omitted and Joseph doubted as Manasses and Joseph) and the precious foundations of the heavenly Jerusalem in the same book.

Sardius first gem of the pectoral and sixth foundation of the Celestial Jerusalem is a red stone, to which St. Epiphanius attributes the colour of fire and blood. "Carnelian" seems the most probable identification.

Topaz is described by Epiphanius as redder than the carbuncle. It may, however, have been rather a yellowish-green stone, but is not to be identified with the modern topaz.

Emerald, third on the breastplate and fourth in the heavenly foundations, is certainly a green stone—than which nothing is more pleasant to look at and nothing more green, says Pliny. Of the twelve varieties mentioned by the author of the *Historia Naturalis*, the most important would be identical with our emerald.

Anthrax or carbuncle, if the name says anything, does not leave a shadow of doubt about its general appearance. It was a "fiery" stone and so delightful to look at that Ben Sirach compares good music at a wine banquet to a gem of anthrax in a setting of gold.

We shall leave to our readers the task of discovering what affinity—if any—there is between these stones and the characters of Ruben, Levi, Simeon, and Juda.

Sapphire will be conceived by every reader as an azure stone which, however, Epiphanius describes as highly purpurascens. He can hardly find adjectives enough to extol its wonderful beauty and dark pleasingness. On theophanies like those granted to Moses and Ezechiel, the throne of God appears as of sapphire. Some suppose it to be lapis lazuli. The modern sapphire is transparent, and probably corresponds more closely to the ancient jacinth. It is second in the foundations of the Celestial City.

Jasper, sixth on the Pontifical breastplate and first in St. John's list, was green and transparent, not like the opaque modern jasper. It can claim to be the chief Johannine term of comparison amongst precious stones; for it is not only the first foundation but also the predominant impression of the vision of God enthroned (4: 3) of the light of the heavenly Jerusalem (21: 11), and of the structure of its wall

(21: 18). The mystery of the affinities of Dan and Nephthali, sons of Bala, with sapphire and jasper we shall leave unsolved.

We begin the third row of the pictoral with the obscure name *ligourion* used to render the Hebrew *leshem*. There seems, at any rate, to be a fair consensus of opinion that it was a yellow stone, if not actually amber.

In the eighth place comes *achates* or agate, named by the Greeks from a river in Sicily (now the Dirillo). It is a banded stone of varying transparency and colour. The *ligurius lapis* and the agate stone had the names of Zelpha's children, Gad and Aser, inscribed.

The ninth stone of the breastplate was amethyst. This wine-coloured stone—*ainōpon anapempousa eidos*, says St. Ephiphanius very poetically—was supposed to be an antidote to the intoxication of wine. The Greek superstition of its anti-intoxicant virtue was paralleled by an etymological dream of the Rabbis that its Hebrew name was derived from its power to procure dreams. The common amethyst is a noble species of quartz of violet or purple colour and "facile to engravers".

Tenth in the sacerdotal breastplate and seventh in St. John's list is the chrysolite or chrysolith, whose name tells its golden hue. Yellow quartz or yellow corundum are suggested identifications. The two last sons of Lia, Zabulon and Issachar had their names respectively inscribed on the amethyst and the chrysolite. The latter's Hebrew name *Tarshish* is taken by some to indicate Spanish origin of the gem, in which case chrysolite may not be an accurate translation. But the LXX never renders it by "beryl", as the English Jacobean version does throughout (Cant. 5: 14; Ez. 1: 16, 10: 9, 28: 13; Dan. 10: 6).

The "Beryl", translating *shōham* is our eleventh stone. *Shōham* is really the first gem which we read of in the Bible, being one of the products of the gold country in the basin of the Hevilath (Gen. 2: 12). In Genesis and in almost all other places the Vulgate translates it *lapis onychinus*. Beryl, which is also the eighth foundation of the supernal City, seems to have been a sea-green stone. Pliny describes it as an emerald or a similar stone and assigns India as its chief birth-place—India eos gignit.

The yellow onyx, which the Greeks called after the finger-nail which its texture resembles, closes the list. It was a banded and semi-transparent silicon. What relation onyx can bear to Benjamin, or beryl to Joseph we again leave to more speculative minds.

Of the four Apocalyptic stones not included in this list we need



only indicate the colours. Chacedony, the third foundation, was, it seems, fine agate of a changing green colour; the sardonix was a variety of onyx with red predominant; chrysoprasus, also a variety of agate, was, as its name indicates, between gold and leek green; the jacinth, our sapphire, was a magnificent blue. These three, sardonix, chrysoprasus, and jacinth were the fifth, the tenth, and the eleventh foundations respectively. All these beautiful stones symbolize, in general, the diversity of the gifts enjoyed by the Blessed in their happy repose in God's own beatitude.

Of the other biblical stones *shāmīr*, the diamond, the enigmatic *kadkōd*, and the three crystals already mentioned nothing need be said here.

We have only just endeavoured to outline a subject of much complexity and very considerable obscurity. We cannot conclude it without recalling the Office of St. Agnes. The Church which is *the* Bride of Christ can say with much greater fulness of meaning than even the Roman heroine who was so young in years and so old in wisdom: "Dexteram meam et collum meum cinxit lapidibus pretiosis . . . circumdedit me vernantibus atque coruscantibus gemmis . . . annulo suo subarrhavit me Dominus Jesus Christus.

W. LEONARD.

\*

\*

\*

\*

### ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY DURING THE WAR.

The outbreak of war taught us what Europe means to the Catholic Church and to Catholic life and thought. Although many fine publications reached us from America, the thought was persistent: What are they thinking and writing in Europe? So it was with pleasure that we received in the last few months the complete set of the *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* for the war years. It was a pleasure, yet it was also sorrowful to read the history of five years—to learn all at once. The sad hand of Death has touched many a figure whose books had endeared them to us. The erudite Pierre De Labriolle is no more. He was well known for his *History of Christian Latin Literature*, which alone among his many works had achieved a wide circulation in English.<sup>1</sup> The Sorbonne professor left behind him a solid mass of work dealing with the history of the early Church and in particular of the Montanist crisis. His critical editions of certain of Tertullian's writings, the

<sup>1</sup>The History and Literature of Christianity: from Tertullian to Boethius. Kegan, Paul and Co., London, 1924.

Confessions of St. Augustine and the Satires of Juvenal are the treasure of those who possess them. In 1934 he published *La Réaction Païenne*, a fascinating study of anti-christian polemical writings which was a veritable godsend for the ecclesiastical historian. De Labriolle had a beautiful style and the gift of never writing a really dull page. Witness in proof of this his delightful chapter on the rise of Monasticism in the *Histoire de l'Eglise* of M.M. Martin and Fliche, only one of the many that he wrote for that work. Another name that was known far beyond the limits of France was that of Abbé G. Constant. He too has disappeared after publishing the second volume of his history of the English Reformation, a long volume on Edward VI. In 1941 a partial translation of this last volume was published in English. (Sheed and Ward.) The French original appears to be about double the size of the translation. Constant had worked on the Reformation in Germany also, but the English Reform became his chosen field. His views, contested in some quarters, rested on a very wide reading. It is with regret that many will learn of the death at an advanced age of Hippolyte Delehaye, Bollandist. The celebrated Jesuit of Brussels had long been regarded as one of the glories of Catholic historical science. His work was always so youthful in its energy and passion, for instance, *Les Légendes Hagiographiques* and *Sanctus*, that it came as a shock to learn that the writer had died. Delehaye is not for beginners; he did not write for them. He wrote for the scientific world, who were quick to see that this modern Bollandist measured up well to the legendary Bollandists of the past. To continue this sad catalogue, we must note the death of Gustave Schnürer. This remarkable historian's fame rests on his book, *The Church and Civilization in the Middle Ages*, which was followed by two further volumes on the same subject, one on the Baroque period, and the other, in 1941, on the XVIII century. These books made a very solid reputation for the writer, the excellence of the first being attested in most glowing terms by that discriminating historian, Louis Halphen, who most happily has survived the black years. The works are in German; the first volume was translated into French, being improved, so Halphen says, in the process. The history of Christian Greek literature of Puech has proved of great use. Its author must also be added to the dead. He was not, it appears from reading his work, a Catholic, and although he lacks the wonderful enthusiasm of a De Labriolle, he was a scholarly and sober writer. Another name must be remembered, that of

Huizinga of Leyden, whose books on the waning of the Middle Ages and on Erasmus were much used in Australian universities. His *Waning of the Middle Ages* (London, 1924) contains many curious facts, but no references are given in English translation. The translation also is very slipshod and rough. One must linger for a moment on Dom Henri Leclercq, the editor, nay the writer of the *Dictionnaire d' Archéologie Chrétienne et Liturgie*.

The *magnum opus* has been finished, the last pages leaving for Paris just before the author's death. To write an encyclopaedia is a task few men would have been able to carry out, but it was only one iron among the many Dom Leclercq kept in the fire, notably his ten volumes on the French Revolution.<sup>2</sup> Of course, it is evident that a man who writes articles as long as small volumes on say, *Palestine*, and in same volume one on *Paris*, must be uneven, in spite of the efforts of a team of note takers. Be that as it may, *D.A.C.L.* would be a wonderful thing to have on a desert island, for after its perusal you would know something about everything. The death of Mgr. J. P. Kirsch, who died at Rome, removed one of the doyens among Catholic historians. At the time of his death, the editor and reviser of *Hergenrother* was director of the Pontifical Institute of Christian Archeology. The German school of history lost its leader in the death of Hans Lietzmann of Berlin. His history of the early church had been translated into English by Protestant scholars, arousing much interest. His studies of the famous question of St. Peter's coming to Rome marked an important stage in that perennial problem. Beyond mentioning the deaths of Bruno Krusch, editor of so many lives of the saints in the Merovingian period, and Hugo Koch, we will spare the reader further gloom.

Turning now to the living, there were many works published during these five years which will demand the attention of those interested in ecclesiastical history. It is good news to learn that G. Bardy took advantage of the war to read all St. Augustine in view of his life of St. Augustine, which appeared in 1941. Those who know Bardy's masterly penetration and lucidity from his Paul of Samosata and his Lucian of Antioch will not be surprised to learn that his St. Augustine is spoken of as the first biography which gives a complete and faithful image of the Bishop of Hippo. The activity of P. Champion in the reigns of Charles IX and Henri III of France excites curiosity, as the author

---

<sup>2</sup>Not to forget his translation and critical revision of Hefele on the Councils.

has few equals in the 15th and 16th centuries. The work of Joseph Lortz, *Die Reformation in Deutschland*, published by Herder at Fribourg, 1939-40, is given a most flattering note by A. De Meyer. The German Catholic professor with serenity has taken up the vast problem of Luther to treat of it with calmness. His work reveals no new facts, but it is stated that his presentation of the results of Lutheran research is remarkable. We wait with eagerness, too, M. De Meyer's own volume on Luther, so long promised. The great collections do not seem to have advanced much. No doubt the publishers of these vast works awaited less critical times. New volumes have been added to the well-known collection, *Evolution de l'Humanité*, edited by Henri Berr, of which some fifty-three volumes have been published. This work has been likewise appearing in English under the title of *History of Civilization*, in which collection De Labriolle's Christian Latin Literature appeared. Volumes have been added to that most useful series of manuals, known under the title of *Clio*. For a deeper knowledge of a period, it would be hard to get a better guide than *Clio*. Their discussion of the literature on the subject and the actual state of the problem in question are most illuminating, especially for the teacher of history. Charles Diehl has completed his volume on the Byzantine Empire for Gustave Glotz's *Histoire générale du Moyen Age*. This too is good news, for with this magnificent guide the difficult nut of the Eastern Empire should be cracked. With Bury and Baynes we could go a certain distance. Now with Diehl, helped and sustained by the great volumes of Vasliev, the average lecturer, so the *R.H.E.* states, will be able to enliven a rather dull and obscure patch of history. Anything is dull until we know a good deal about it. So there will be no more excuses in Byzantine affairs at least. Delayed by two world wars, the *Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie Ecclésiastiques*, begun in 1912, now includes ten volumes, which are devoted to the first two letters of the alphabet. When it will be finished and how many volumes it will have are a puzzle and a delight for all the patient lovers of ecclesiastical history.<sup>3</sup>

Since we began this note the volumes published during the war by Fliche and Martin in their *Histoire de l'Eglise* have come to hand. Up to the outbreak of war seven volumes had been printed of the twenty-four projected. Now volume eight (Gregory VII) and volume nine,

---

<sup>3</sup>Letouzey is carrying on the encyclopaedias *D.T.C.*, *D.A.C.L.*, etc., but not more than one volume was printed during the war.



of which for the moment only the first half has appeared, have been printed. The work is to be continued, of course, and of the contributors the name of Constant is alone missing, to which must be added that of A. Leman, whose recent death will force the editors to seek another writer for the important volume XVIII of the collection. Of M. Fliche's work on the Gregorian reformation we may be able to write in a later issue of the *A.C.R.*

T. VEECH.

## Book Reviews

TOO SMALL A WORLD, the Life of Francesca Cabrini, by Theodore Maynard, p. xv, 335. Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee, U.S.A. 2 doll. 50 c.

Francesca Cabrini was born in Lodi, Lombardy, in 1850. She died in Chicago in December, 1917, and was beatified 21 years later. Thus her biographers claim three records for her: she had become a naturalized citizen of the U.S.A. and so was the first of that nation to be beatified; the introduction of her cause only ten years after her death had no precedent; and finally, Cardinal Mundelein, who celebrated the Beatification High Mass, claimed that he was the first Cardinal to celebrate the funeral service and the beatification of the same person.

Having trained as a teacher, she acceded to the request of her parish priest to take charge of an orphanage, the "House of Providence", in the town of Codogno. Later the Bishop of Lodi made her Superior of a diocesan Institute which he was founding. Subjects gathered round her rapidly, and several houses were founded in Northern Italy. In 1887 she journeyed to Rome, had an interview with Leo XIII, got approval for her Rule, and founded a house in the Eternal City.

She had always had thoughts of work in China. At this time, however, the Roman authorities were seriously worried at the spiritual plight of Italian immigrants in North America, and ordered her to commence there the foreign missionary career of her sisters. Incidentally the biography gives a very interesting account of Italian emigration to the U.S.A. It will, perhaps, throw some light on similar problems in our own country.

From now on she became a constant traveller. New York was her first foreign foundation. For a novitiate in the new world she purchased just outside New York a fine property, which the Jesuits were abandoning for want of water. In a short time she herself found a fine spring in the grounds. Foundations came quickly, in Central America, South America, Spain, France, England. In all before her death sixty seven houses were opened, and her Institute numbered over one thousand subjects.

Her health was always poor, yet she crossed the Atlantic more than twenty times. She personally supervised the opening of practi-

cally ever new house. Difficulties she overcame by personal interviews, and Popes, Cardinals, business men (often non-Catholic), statesmen (often anti-Catholic), all surrendered to what must have been a very extraordinary charm of manner. The world was her province, and the title of her biography is taken from an answer she made to one who expostulated with her at her readiness to undertake so rapidly, widely scattered works.

We would have liked to know more of her own spiritual life, and of her methods of training her young religious. Something is told, but the book would have gained if more of this matter had been included. It would have been interesting, too, to learn how a Superior General of a rapidly expanding Religious Institute could carry on the great volume of routine business that must have come her way, while continually undertaking long journeys.

This is a book that can be warmly recommended. Theodore Maynard is a practised craftsman, and the biography is bright, yet written with a pleasant dignity and care that form a welcome contrast to several works of hagiography that have come from American authors in the last few years.

J.H.

\*

\*

\*

\*

"WE HAVE BEEN FRIENDS TOGETHER," by Raissa Maritain. Longmans, Green and Co. New York, 1943. pp. 208. (No. 2 Golden Measure Books).

Any book bearing the name of Maritain is assured of the faithful affection of a large and constant audience. In this book Madame Jacques Maritain proposes to tell not only the story of her own and her husband's life, but also that of their friends. The proper study of mankind is man, and we of the twentieth century certainly are not starved in that respect. All manner of people have stripped off the trappings of rank and profession so that the whole world can sit back and enjoy in -comfort their adventures. Here we have the confessions of the wife of a philosopher. Once upon a time the idea of being a philosopher's wife would not be looked upon as the most exciting of existences. Philosophers dwelt in drab tomes that contained no illustrations, no preface simply the doctrine pure and simple. Madame Maritain however has some surprises for us. First of all, we have the portraits of M. and Mme. Maritain at the time of their wedding. The present French Ambassador to the

Vatican is hardly recognizable in the young, scantily bearded youth of 1905, leaning so awkwardly on his hand, a pose which was the last word with the photographers of those benighted years. Then you begin to think what manner of people are these two. Raissa Maritain was born far from the Paris she loves and celebrates in a style which is always rather embarrassing for the non-Parisian: "O city of Saint Geneviève and of Saint Denis, . . . city of Racine and Pascal . . . of Victor Hugo and of Baudelaire . . . most precious jewel" and so on. Like Renan's Prayer on the Acropolis, this may appeal to the French critical spirit, but it is a mystery to others who witness the French touch so light becoming as heavy as Carlyle at his worst. Madame Maritain was born of Jewish parents at Marioupol on the shores of the Sea of Azov, a name which was a headline in the Russo-German struggle of a few years ago. She gives a delightful picture of her pious, Jewish parents and the Tsarist days in Russia seen through a little girl's eyes. The anti-semitic feeling in old Russia decided her parents to emigrate to New York, but a friend happily persuaded them to come instead to Paris. They arrived at the Gare du Nord on a morning of fog and rain, so sad to little Russian eyes, as sad as the last vision that Rimbaud had of the City. But gradually she loved Paris, not the Paris of the sacré Montparno, of Montmatre, of the Boulevards, but the Paris of the Latin Country. Close to the Sorbonne the foreign family dwelling in the Russian quarter became Parisian—peace to the restless spirit of Léon Daudet. At the age of sixteen Raissa was ready for the Sorbonne. She was coached for the entrance examination by a young law student who had the fortune of being named Casanova. The fiery tutor was so thrilled with his pupil's success that he there and then proposed marriage. The young girl, having avoided this unusual coach, found much to interest her in the nomadic Russians who frequented her parents' home. She learnt something of the nihilism of these shabby Russians whom Paris treated as picturesque but a rather peculiar form of decoration of the *Quartier* Paris little knew. The young Russian girl had a longing for truth. To know what is was the guiding light of her life. She was seventeen when she met a young man with a gentle face, a heavy shock of blond hair, a light beard and a slightly stoop-shouldered carriage. He was busy forming a committee to protest to the Russian government because of its treatment of Russian socialists. Monsieur Jacques Maritain has become an important figure in the world of letters, his appear-



ance has changed, but he is still busy forming committees against oppression. There are—or there were—Russian refugees in the *Quartier*; they are Whites being oppressed by the Reds. But in 1905 it was the Whites who were oppressing the Reds. From this beginning, romance began between the French student and the Russian Jewess with the exotic name of Raissa, which puzzled the old bear, Léon Bloy, who on reading the name wondered if he had to deal with man or woman. Maritain is a grandson of Jules Favre, the republican and rationalist leader of nineteenth century France. Through him, according to Mme. Maritain, the line runs to Blessed Peter Favre (Le Fèvre), the first priest of the Society of Jesus. Jacques Maritain had been baptized by a Protestant minister. The young couple were inseparable. The anxious parent sees that even philosophy is dangerous when set in the *Quartier* with the Louvre to add *décor*. Friends added zest to the conversation and in first place Ernest Psichari, whose portrait is given likewise leaning on one hand. Psichari, the name is Greek, was a grandson of Renan and he had been baptized in the Greek rite. The Jewess, the Protestant, the Greek! Madame Maritain promises us a further volume on Psichari whose return to the Faith of his French fathers was effected by means of the French Army and the solitudes of Africa. He fell in 1914 in the first heroic, furious campaign which poured out so recklessly the red sweet wine of youth. Next, the young couple encounter Charles Péguy, who likewise died at the Marne in 1914, died in the hour of victory. He was forty years of age. Péguy's fame is remarkable, and in the recent disasters and humiliation of France, the name of Péguy and his mystical love of France have won him and his work extraordinary fame. When they knew him he was engaged—he the defender of France's honour, he the impassioned soldier—in defending Dreyfus. Hence he was attracted to Raissa the Jewess: "I know this people [Jews] well. It has no spot on its hide which does not ache, where there is not some old bruise, some ancient scar, some secret woe..." He too returned to the Faith, but not to its practice, although all his friends take heart that during the tremendous weeks of September, 1914, the paladin of France, Eternal France, found at last the comfort and rest of His Saviour. The Sorbonne and its philosophy—its history of philosophy—did not satisfy these ardent lovers of truth. Very touchingly is described the wave of scepticism that came over the youthful pair. The wonder is how any young Frenchman or Frenchwoman was "croyant" in that atmosphere. Yet God works choosing his own instruments. It was Péguy who sent the

pair to listen to Bergson at the Collège de France. Péguy was what must be called a bad Catholic. His marriage was a civil one, and although after his conversion, he attempted to persuade his wife, she refused to budge or to allow the children to be brought up as Catholics. After his death in 1914, both she and children became Catholics—poor Péguy. It was Péguy then who sent them to Bergson, and Bergson rescued them from the dread of atheism. The next step towards conversion was by means of Maurice Maeterlinck. Maeterlinck, the Belgian poet, has had many ups and downs, but he probably never converted anyone before or since—that is not speaking too harshly of this eminent man. He most generously gave a note of wondering praise to the *La Femme Pauvre* of one Léon Bloy. The Maritains read the note, read Bloy's book and wished to meet the man who wrote it. Psichari, Bergson, Péguy, Bloy—and Bloy the most mysterious of them all. Some twenty years ago Shane Leslie wrote an appreciation of Bloy, just after Bloy's death, in *Studies* which struck many a youthful reader as the most wonderful thing written since Matthew Arnold's celebrated and intoxicating essay on Henrich Heine. Here then was Bloy, the integral Catholic, quarrelling with priests, as the the writer of this review can testify having seen in the British Museum a whole collection of anti-Bloy pamphlets written by enthusiastic clerics of the time. Here he was the beggar, the ungrateful. "Come," he wrote to the Maritains, "come to Montmatre and under the shadow of the dome, you will find me at home". Péguy and Verlaine were poor, but particularly in the case of Verlaine romance has draped legends over his eccentric habits, but Bloy was poor in a humdrum and sordid fashion. They met him attired in his famous corduroy suit buttoned to the neck, which allowed him to without a shirt. Bloy completed, under God, the spiritual progress of the Maritains. How? Well, that is hard to say. Reading Bloy with his wonderfully rich vocabulary and welter of invective that won Léon Daudet's reluctant awe, it seems hard to think that he would appeal to such a pair. Yet such is the power of the artist. The theologian may weigh his words, and delight in his convincing arguments; the exegete may explain all the crucial points; the apologist may prove the truth of his thesis. Yet so often they fail to move, whereas the artist with that fire within him that men cannot acquire by study, or by being shrewd, or by being up to date, or by knowing the right people, the artist takes it in his stride. Bloy taught them humility, he taught them to love



Our Lady of La Salette, and also his favourite saint, St. Barnabas. Soon the grace of God came to help the seed planted by Psichari, Péguy, Bergson and Bloy—and with Bloy for godfather they were received into the Catholic Church. Madame Maritain's second volume (already published overseas) will take up the story from there. The book is a translation from the French made in New York during war time exile in America. It will appeal to all who are interested in the Maritains and those who love the great city at the turn of the century. It leaves one anxious to continue the life story of this fascinating woman.

T.V.